notes on leviticus

george bush

George Bush

Born in Norwich, Vermont, June 17, 1796. Died at Rochester, New York, September 19, 1858. He entered Dartmouth College at the age of eighteen, passed through a course of theological study at Princeton, in 1824 was appointed a missionary at the West,and became settled as the pastor of a Presbyterian church at Indianapolis. He resigned this charge and came to New York in 1829. In 1831 he was elected professor of Hebrew and Oriental literature in the University of New York, and immediately entered upon a literary career which won for him the reputation of profound scholarly ability. In 1840 he began a series of Bible commentaries, which, under the title of Notes on Genesis, Exodus etc. down to judges, still remains an acknowledged authority.

James & Klock
1977 Book List

R. Candlish
Life in a Risen Saviour

John Eadie
Commentary on Colossians
Commentary on Ephesians
Commentary on Galatians
Commentary on Thessalonians

W. Fairweather
The Background of the Gospels
The Background of the Epistles

A.R. Fausset
Commentary on the Book of Judges

G.G. Findlay
Fellowship in Life Eternal

(List continued on back flap)

NOTES,

CRITICAL AND PRACTICAL,

ON THE BOOK OF

LEVITICUS:

DESIGNED AS A GENERAL HELP TO

BIBLICAL READING AND INSTRUCTION.

By GEORGE BUSH,

PROF. OF HEB. AND ORIENT. LIT. N. Y. CITY UNIVERSITY.

NEW-YORK:
PUBLISHED BY NEWMAN AND IVISON,
199 Broadway.
CINCINNATI: MOORE & ANDERSON. AUBURN: J. C. IVISON & CO
CHICAGO: S. C. GRIGGS & CO DETROIT: A. McFARREN.

1852.

Reprint 1976 by;
James & Klock Publishing Co.
2527 Girard Avenue, North
Minneapolis, MN. 55411

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *Title, Author, Date, &c.*

THE Hebrews, according to their usual custom, denominate this, the third book in the order of the Pentateuch, ויקרא *va-yikra, and he called*, from its initial word. By the Septuagint it is called Λευϊτικον, *leuitikon* (*levitikon*), of which the Vulgate title 'Leviticus' is the Latinized form; and this has been retained by our own and all the modern versions. It is so called from the fact that it treats principally of the rites and ceremonies, the services and sacrifices, of the religion of the Israelites, the charge of which was committed to the *Levitical* priesthood, that is, to Aaron and his sons, or descendants, who were of the tribe of *Levi*, and who alone of that tribe exercised the priestly office. It is not, therefore, the *ministry of the Levites* properly so called, who constituted a distinct order from the priests, and subordinate to them, that forms the subject of this book, for of *their* services a much fuller account is contained in the book of Numbers than in the present. It is of the peculiar functions of the sacerdotal body usually termed 'the sons of Aaron,' that the book, for the most part, treats, for which reason it is denominated by the Talmudists תורת הכהנים *torath hakkohanim, the law of the priests*, and תורת הקרבנות *torath hakkorbanoth, the law of the offerings*. The 'sons of Aaron,' or the priests, were merely assisted in the performance of their sacred office by the descendants of the other branch of Levi's family, who obtained the privilege of officiating as a kind of second order of the priesthood, in recompense of the ready zeal which they displayed against idolatry and the worshippers of the golden calf.

That Moses was the real author of this book, is proved, not only by the general arguments which demonstrate him to have written the whole Pentateuch, but by particular passages in other portions of the Scriptures where it is expressly cited as his inspired work. Thus, Nehem. 8. 14, 'And they found written in the law which the Lord had commanded *by Moses*, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month.' This ordinance is contained Lev. 23. 34, 42. Again it is said of the mother of Jesus, Luke 2. 22, that 'When the days of her purification *according to the law of Moses*, were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem,' a law which is to be found Lev. 12. 6. Once more, it is said 2 Chron. 30. 16, of the priests and Levites, that 'they stood in their place, after their manner, *according to the law of Moses*, the man of the Lord; the priests sprinkled of the blood which they received of the hand of the Levites.' This regulation occurs Lev. 1. 5. The true authorship of the book is by these passages put beyond question.

The time and place at which the book was written, are determined by the

words occurring ch. 27. 34, 'These are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai.' That this is to be understood not only of those laws which were orally promulgated at that time and place, but of those also which were committed to writing, may be inferred from the parallel expression, Num. 36. 13, 'These are the commandments and the judgments which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses, unto the children of Israel, in the plains of Moab, by Jordan, near Jericho.' As it was in the plains of Moab here mentioned that Moses died, and as the precepts in the book of Numbers could not have been written either prior or subsequent to the period of the sojourn at that station, it is reasonable to conclude, that if in one case mention is made of *written* laws, the same is to be understood in the other. So that there is no room to question that this book was written during the encampment of Israel at the foot of Mount Sinai. This is strikingly confirmed by such allusions as the following, indicating that the state of the Israelites at the time, was that of an encampment, instead of a permanent settlement in cities and villages. Lev. 4. 12, 'The whole bullock shall he carry forth *without the camp*.' v. 28, 'And afterward he shall come *into the camp*.' Ch. 14. 33, 'And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, *When ye be come* into the land of Canaan which I give to you,' &c. implying that they had not yet arrived there.

§ 2. *The Period embraced by the History.*

Archbishop Usher, who is followed by Mr. Horne, supposes that the book comprises the history of the transactions of a single month, viz. from April 21 to May 21, of the year 2514, which answers to the first month of the second year after the departure from Egypt. Others consider it as containing only the account of what passed during the eight days of the consecration of Aaron and his sons. The former is the more generally received opinion, but as the book itself contains no definite data by which the chronological arrangement of its facts can be adjusted, we can affirm nothing positive on the subject.

§ 3. *Divisions, Contents, &c.*

By the Jews this book is divided into ten פרשות *parashoth*, or larger divisions and twenty-three סדרים *siderim*, or smaller divisions. These, in the arrangement of our Bibles, are comprised in twenty-seven chapters, of which the contents may be again subdivided and classified as follows:

PART I.—*Laws concerning Sacrifices.*

	CHAPTER
I. Of the burnt-offerings,	
II. Of the meat-offerings,	
III. Of the peace-offerings,	
IV. Of the sin-offerings,	4,
V Of the trespass-offerings,	6,

PART II.—*Institution of the Priesthood.*

I. The consecration of Aaron and his sons,	
II. The offerings at the consecration of the priests,	
III. Death of Nadab and Abihu,	

CHAPTERS

PART III.—*Distinction of Clean and Unclean Animals.*

I. Unclean beasts, birds, fishes, &c. specified, - - - - - 11

PART IV.—*Laws concerning Purification.*

I. Of women after child-birth, - - - - - - - - - 12
II. Of persons infected with leprosy, - - - - - - - 13, 14
III. Of persons having bad issues, - - - - - - - - 15

PART V.—*Various Regulations.*

I. Concerning the great day of atonement, - - - - - - 16
II. " the place of offering sacrifices, - - - - - 17
III. " things prohibited to be eaten, - - - - - - 17
IV. " incestuous connexions, - - - - - - - 18
V. " idolatry and various other crimes, - - - - 19–22

PART VI.—*Laws concerning the Festivals, Vows, and Tithes.*

I. The sabbath, passover, pentecost, feast of trumpets, day of atonement, and feast of tabernacles, - - - - - - - - 23
II. Various ceremonial and judicial rites relative to sacred festivals, 24
III. Law of the sabbatic year, year of jubilee, &c. - - - - - 25
IV. Prohibition of idolatry, &c. - - - - - - - - - 26
V. Of vows, things devoted, and tithes, - - - - - - - 27

§ 4. *Argument, Scope, &c.*

Although the book of Leviticus contains some matters purely historical, yet its leading scope is to record the laws concerning the sacrifices, ordinances, and institutions of that remarkable economy from which it derives its name. The established worship of the Hebrews was offering—not prayer, said or chanted, nor instrumental music, nor any like form of devotion—but the presenting to the Deity certain articles of food and drink. This system of worship is not to be understood as having originated at the time to which the book refers. As there were moral laws in the world by which human conduct was more or less governed prior to the delivery of the Decalogue from Mount Sinai, so it is evident from the history of Cain and Abel, of Noah, of Abraham, and other patriarchs, that sacrificial offerings are to be dated back to the earliest periods of which we have any account. They constituted the prevailing form in which the spirit of devotion was taught to express itself from the very infancy of the race. But as sacrifices were ordained to enter largely into the dispensation now about to be established, they are in this book instituted, as it were, anew, placed upon their true foundation, and commanded with circumstances which gave them greater importance, and served to illustrate their typical character with more effect.

The sacrifices prescribed in the Levitical worship, were of two kinds; the *bloody* and the *unbloody*; or the *animal* and the *vegetable* offerings; the latter consisting of *fruits* and *libations*.

(I.) THE BLOODY SACRIFICES.—These consisted, (1.) of *Holocausts*, which were offered to the Lord entire, and were considered as ranking highest in dig-

nity and excellence, for which reason Moses commences the law of sacrifices with them. (2.) *Sin and Trespass-offerings*, distinguished from the holocausts by certain parts only of the animal being burnt on the altar, while the flesh was eaten by the priests. (3.) *Eucharistical Sacrifices*, or *Thank-offerings*. In these the fat only was consumed on the altar, a small portion being allotted by law to the priest, and all the rest being eaten at a solemn and joyful feast by the offerer and his guests.

(II.) UNBLOODY SACRIFICES, OR MEAT-OFFERINGS.—These consisted of flour, bread, cakes, and ears of corn and grain roasted, of which a full account is given in ch. 2. The *libations* were of wine, and although the mode of pouring them out is nowhere described, yet it is most likely that the wine was poured out of some vessel upon the top of the altar.

That these sacrifices had all of them a typical intent ; that they were 'shadows of good things to come,' pointing more or less distinctly to 'the body which is of Christ,' the whole epistle to the Hebrews is a continued proof. The imposition of hands upon the head of the victim, the shedding of its blood, and the consumption of its members upon the altar, were prefigurative acts setting forth, by a kind of dramatic representation, the future offering of the 'Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world.' The requisite qualities of these sacrificial victims were emblematical of Christ's immaculate character, and the law of their oblation was a practical hieroglyphic of the great gospel truth of the atonement. So also were the outward washings and purifications enjoined by the Mosaic law, designed to intimate the necessity of inward purity. Indeed, if these institutions be severed from their New Testament relations, we have no key to unlock the hidden meaning of the Pentateuch, and the whole ritual contained in it dwindles down to a burdensome round of unmeaning ceremonies. But when regarded in the light now suggested, the whole service, like the veil on the face of Moses, conceals a spiritual radiance under an outward covering, and the wisdom of the various appointments appears at once worthy of its divine Author. To what extent the spiritual import of these rites was actually understood by the Jews themselves, it may not be easy to determine ; but that something, over and above the simple act of slaying and offering the animal victim, was required by the spirit of the law is evident from the fact, that the obedience of the chosen people is frequently represented as faulty, notwithstanding their scrupulous observance of the outward rite. Thus Isai. 1. 11, 12, 'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord : I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts ; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats.'

But while the Jews probably in great measure fell short of apprehending the true typical genius of their own dispensation, and consequently rejected its divine Fulfiller when he came, an error is often committed on the other hand, in modern times, by the attempt to elicit more from these figurative institutions than they were intended to convey. It by no means follows that because certain portions of the Levitical economy have a typical purport, we have therefore a right to give loose to imagination and multiply types at will, as if the Scriptures meant all that they can be made to mean. This was the fault of many of the earlier interpreters, who so abounded in mystical senses as to convert nearly the whole system into a mass of fancied allegories and typical allusions, which

Luther very properly characterized as the '*froth* of scripture.' To such lengths was this style of interpretation carried by Origen, Hesychius, and their disciples in later times, that one can scarcely open a volume of their commentaries without reading in the title-page that the 'mystical sense is duly expounded;' evidently implying that the duty of the commentator was by no means discharged by the accurate grammatical exegesis of the text; but that he was bound in addition to penetrate beyond the surface of the letter, and enlighten his readers by an exhibition of the manifold occult meanings hidden beneath the surface, and constituting those abysmal depths of import, which the plummet of lexicography could never presume to sound.

It may be difficult, indeed, to lay down precise rules which shall be universally applicable in the way of interpretation, but the grand canon undoubtedly is, to follow strictly the apostolical explanations, where we have them; and, where we have them not, to proceed with extreme caution, adhering rigidly to the analogy of faith, and standing as remote as possible from any thing which may appear fanciful, and give occasion to cavillers to discard typical expositions altogether. Under these restrictions we may safely recognize a typical import in many items of the Levitical law which are not *expressly* affirmed by the New Testament writers to be possessed of that character; and, in fact, in no other way will that wondrous polity disclose to us the whole richness of its evangelical implications.

§ 5. *Commentators.*

The remark made under this head in the introduction to the Notes on Exodus, holds strictly true of the book of Leviticus, viz. that it has been the subject of few commentaries except such as have at the same time embraced either the whole Pentateuch or the whole Bible. In pointing out therefore the sources of illustration for this portion of the Mosaic writings, I can do little more than recite the authorities already specified in my preceding volumes. They will be found enumerated at considerable length in the prolegomena to the work on Exodus, with critical estimates of the character and value of each. These it will be unnecessary to repeat at length in the present connexion, but it may subserve the convenience and information of the reader, to be furnished with the titles of those works, from which he may hope to derive the most essential aid in the study of the scope and genius of the Levitical law. The following may be cited as claiming perhaps the first place in this relation :—

Outram's Dissertations on the Jewish Sacrifices.
Lowman on the Hebrew Ritual,
J. P. Smith on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ.
Faber on the Three Dispensations.
" Horæ Mosaicæ.
Willett's Hexapla on Leviticus.
Pictorial Bible.
Lightfoot's Works.
Magee on the Atonement.
Witsius' Miscellanea Sacra.
Saurin's Dissertations.
Michaelis' Comment. on Laws of Moses.
Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum.
Graves on the Pentateuch.
Warburton's Divine Legation.
Davison on Sacrifices.
Sykes on do.
Bahr's Symbolik of the Mosaic Worship (Germ.)
Owen's Prelim. Dissert. on Epistle to the Hebrews.
Ainsworth on the Pentateuch.

To most of the above works I have had recourse in the preparation of the ensuing Notes, but to one of the number—The Pictorial Bible—I feel constrained on this, as on former occasions, to express my indebtedness in a more particular manner. The Notes of the Editor, Mr. Kitto, can scarcely be consulted on any point of which he treats without advantage, but it is more especially in the department of modern oriental manners and usages, that his work is so signally in advance of any other Biblical Commentary. From having himself spent several years as a traveler in the East, he has been enabled to make the existing institutions, laws, and customs of those ancient regions of the globe most happily tributary to the explanation of a multitude of passages which had never before the light of a satisfactory solution cast upon them. On all subjects of this nature, it will be perceived that I have drawn largely upon his pages, and so also in the natural history of the beasts, birds, and fishes mentioned in the eleventh chapter, in laying down the distinction between the clean and the unclean. For a very large part of the annotations on that chapter, requiring a species of knowledge to which a mere critical or practical expositor can seldom be expected to lay claim, I have been indebted to the results of his accurate inquiries. Being conscious of the necessity, in this province of my work, of 'entering into other men's labors,' I trust the reader, instead of objecting to my copious extracts, will rather be grateful that I have provided so liberally from this source for his information in a field of comment, into which he has probably often come 'seeking fruit, and finding none.'

In reference to the work now offered as a new *korban* on the altar of Biblical learning, a few words will be permitted. The book which I have here undertaken to illustrate on the plan of my previous volumes, constitutes a part of the sacred canon less read, and usually accounted less interesting and important, than almost any other. Although not omitted, of course, in any regular reading of the Scriptures entire from beginning to end, yet it is seldom returned to on any other occasion; and in Bible-class and Sunday-school instruction is almost invariably passed by. May I be allowed to express the hope, that the present volume will be found, in no small measure, to have redeemed this book from the comparative disparagement which has fallen upon it? If the ensuing notes shall have the effect of transferring to the reader, in any good degree, the feeling of intense interest which has pervaded the mind of the author in the prosecution of his labors, the book will rise in his estimation with the perusal of every successive chapter, till at the close he shall acknowledge that revelation is rich even in its poorest parts, and that without the accurate knowledge of the Law which he here acquires, he never could so fully have understood the nature and value of the Gospel.

No apology will be required by the thorough student of the Bible for the very frequent citation of the original in its appropriate type. The sentences are always translated, and I doubt not they will in many instances verify to the reader's mind the remark, which has so often occurred to my own, that a strictly literal rendering of a passage of Scripture is, in multitudes of cases, the very best commentary that can be offered upon it. The Hebrew is given without points, not from any slight esteem of the value of that appendage to the language, but simply in order to preserve the symmetry of the page by preventing the lines from being thrown unduly asunder.

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS.

CHAPTER I.

THE BURNT-OFFERING.

In the system of Jewish sacrifices, the Burnt-offerings, treated of in this chapter, held the most conspicuous place. They were of all others the most ancient; as the acceptable offering of Abel was undoubtedly of this description, and the worship both of Noah and Abraham, long prior to the time of Moses, included them as an essential element. Indeed, the directions concerning offerings in the chapter before us, are introduced in such a way as to indicate that the Lawgiver was not propounding a new form of worship, but regulating the ritual of one already understood and used: 'When any man of you shall bring an offering to the Lord, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock.' The earliest records of heathen antiquity show, moreover, that such sacrifices were in use among nearly all nations, and distinguished by accompanying rites and ceremonies very similar to those observed by the Hebrews, clearly indicating that they derived their origin from the same source, to wit, a divine institution ordained to the parents of the race, and kept up among the antediluvians, from whom, through Noah and his family, it was transmitted to all subsequent generations of men, wherever dispersed over the earth.

The original term for *burnt-offering*, עלה *olāh*, comes from the root, עלה *âlâh, to ascend*. It is so called, because it was laid whole on the altar, and then, with the exception of the skin, being consumed by fire, the greatest part of it *ascended towards heaven*. Its equivalents in other languages are as follows; Chal. עלתא *altâ, ascension;* כלילא *kelil, entireness;* גמרא *gemira, oblation*. Gr. ὁλοκαρπώσις, καρπωμα, ὁλοκαυτωμα, all conveying the idea of a *fire-offering wholly consumed*, which is also clearly intimated by the Latin word 'holocaustum,' *holocaust*. The sacrifice consisted in the immolating of a *male animal victim*, which was sometimes a bull of three years old, sometimes a sheep or goat of one year old, and sometimes, but more rarely, a turtle-dove, or young pigeon. But from whatever class of the animal kingdom it were taken, whether from the herd or the flock, whether it were bullock, ram, or goat, one thing was indispensable—it was to be perfect in its kind, 'a male without blemish.' This rule was given to intimate to the people the reverence and respect with which they should regard God, and every part of his service. It would be highly unbecoming to offer to him any thing that was lame, or blind, or diseased, or in any other way of little value. He will be served with every creature's best. But this was not all. The animal was to be the most excellent of its kind, in order the more fitly to shadow forth the excellencies of Him who was to be the great substance of this type, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and who alone of all that ever partook of our nature was truly without sin. As he was to be a spotless Savior, so his representing type was to be a spotless victim. In addition to this it is to be observed, that the animal was to be selected from among those that were used for food, and were most eminently ser-

viceable to man; thus teaching him, that in serving God we are not to withhold from him even that which is most near and dear to us, which goes to sustain our being and constitute our comforts. As we received all from him, so we must render back all to him. Nor must we here fail to notice that peculiar feature of the law, by which the oblation was to be varied according to the ability of the offerer. While the rich man presented his bullock, the considerate and benignant spirit of the law made provision for the poor man also, who, as his circumstances would permit, might bring a lamb or a pigeon, with the assurance of its being equally acceptable with the costlier gift of his neighbor. No one was to be discouraged from approaching God, by the consideration that he was not able to present to him such an offering as he could wish. He would have no man, however humble, excluded from the pleasures and benefits, to say nothing of the duties, of such a religious observance. So legibly do we find the stamp of the divine beneficence impressed upon the smallest items of his institutions.

The various ceremonies connected with the rite of the Burnt-offering, will be considered in detail, as we proceed in our annotations; but we observe here, in regard to the *occasions* on which this species of offering was made, that they were both public and private. As their design was, in the main, *expiatory*, they were presented, partly, in the name of the whole nation, daily, every morning and evening, as also in connexion with a sin-offering on the great day of atonement, and on the three principal anniversary festivals;—partly, on the solemnity of consecration to office—and partly by private persons, in order to be freed from the condition of Levitical uncleanness; namely, by women after child-bearing, at the end of the legally prescribed period for the purification,—by lepers when cured,—by Nazarites, when they had touched a dead body,—and by those referred to in Lev. 15. 1–15.

We say that the *design* of these offerings was mainly *expiatory;* and such was undoubtedly the case. At the same time, it is to be observed, that in the early ages of the world, when no other sacrifices were offered but whole burnt-offerings, this one kind of sacrifice was also *petitionary* and *eucharistic*, and was in fact applied to every part of sacred worship, according to the circumstances and promptings of each individual. This is clearly deducible from the inspired history. Noah offered burnt-offerings as an expression of gratitude to God for the preservation of himself and his family through the perils of the deluge. Job added burnt-offerings to prayers, when he interceded for forgiveness for his sons and his friends. Balaam, following, beyond doubt, the general custom, directed burnt-offerings to be prepared when he was about to pray for safety to Balak, and destruction to the Israelites. That burnt offerings used also to be presented as votive and voluntary oblations, may be inferred from the language of David, Ps. 63. 13–15, 'I will go into thine house with *burnt-offerings;* I will pay thee my vows, which my lips have uttered, and my mouth hath spoken, when I was in trouble. I will offer unto thee *burnt-sacrifices* of fatlings, with the incense of rams; I will offer bullocks with goats.' Ps. 61. 18, 19. 'Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with *burnt-offerings and whole burnt-offerings;* then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar.' In the former of these passages is doubtless to be understood votive offerings; and in the latter, voluntary ones.

And it is *voluntary* offerings, unquestionably, which are contemplated in the

CHAPTER I.

AND the Lord[a] called unto Moses, and spake unto him[b] out

[a] Ex. 19, 3.

of the tabernacle of the congregation, saying,

[b] Ex. 40, 34, 35. Num. 12, 4, 5.

chapter before us. The burnt-offering about which directions are here given, was not the public offering of the lamb, morning and evening, nor one prescribed to the Israelites at any appointed time, or upon any particular occasion. It had respect to an offering to be brought by any individual, whenever he felt himself so disposed. It was ordered in view of those seasons in the pious Israelite's experience, when he felt his mind under more than ordinary impressions; when he was sensible of his general sinfulness and deficiencies; and when he would humbly seek mercy for those manifold offences and failings which are not particularly specified, and had no express offering appointed for them.

As to the leading typical design of the Burnt-offering, nothing can be clearer than that it had a special regard to the offering of Christ in a human body. It is so stated in the epistle to the Hebrews; 'When he cometh into the world he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me; in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me), to do thy will, O God.' Here were the sins of a whole world to be atoned for; here were innumerable transgressions of innumerable persons, which needed mercy. The time was come when the cattle upon a thousand hills would be no longer accepted, but the offering of the Son of God was to supersede them all. He was to be slain, who alone could present an oblation worthy to be accepted as an expiation for the sins of untold millions of human beings. Such an offering he *did* present in the sacrifice of himself on the cross, and the *intensity* of his sufferings in undergoing that vicarious martyrdom is not inaptly denoted by the burning of the whole Burnt-offering which was so expressly enjoined. But without appearing to *press* the coincidences between the type and the antitype, when every thing is taken into consideration, we see not how a doubt can remain that the sacrifice of the Burnt-offering was designed as a piacular substitute for the individual in whose behalf it was brought to the altar. With these remarks we are prepared to enter upon the explication of the text.

1. *And the Lord called unto Moses, and spake unto him, &c.* Heb. וַיִּקְרָא *vayikra, and he called.* The word 'Lord,' though inserted by our translators in the first clause, occurs in the original only in the second;—'And he called unto Moses, and the Lord said,' &c. A similar construction occurs in Lev. 8. 15: 'And he slew it, and Moses took the blood,' &c.—where it would seem, from the context, that it was Moses who slew the sacrifice. Still the note on that passage will show that there is some degree of doubt as to the true construction. The Jerus. Targ. in this place renders, 'And the Word of the Lord called,' &c. As the cloud of glory now filled the tabernacle, and prevented all access to its interior, Moses stood without while an audible voice from the mercy-seat addressed him in the words immediately following. The word '*called*,' in the original, has the last letter written in smaller character than the rest, intimating, according to the Jews, that God now spake, not with a loud thundering voice, as upon Mount Sinai, but in lower and gentler tones, as befitted a milder and more permanent mode of communica-

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, c If any man of you bring an offering unto the LORD, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, *even* of the herd, and of the flock.

c ch. 22, 18, 19.

tion.——¶ *Out of the tabernacle of the congregation.* Heb. מאהל מועד *mëohel moëd*, more correctly rendered *tabernacle of meeting*, or *convention-tent*, i. e., the tent or tabernacle where God and his people met at stated times. See Note on Ex. 27. 21, where it is shown that the term implies the meeting of two parties by previous appointment. Gr. ἐκ τῆς σκηνῆς του μαρτυρίου, *from the tabernacle of the testimony.* Compare Num. 11. 53, Acts 7. 14. By the phrase 'out of the tabernacle,' is meant, out of the most holy place, from over the mercy-seat, and between the cherubim, where God was said peculiarly to reside. Hitherto he had spoken to Moses out of heaven, or out of the cloud; but having taken possession of the temple prepared for him, he makes that his audience-chamber, and gives his servant orders from thence. It does not appear that Moses was commanded to come *into* the tabernacle, as the precluding glory probably now filled the sacred edifice, but we may suppose that he stood without, at or near the entrance, and there reverently listened to the uttered voice of Jehovah.

2. *If any man of you bring an offering.* Heb. אדם כי יקריב מכם קרבן *adam ki yakrib mikkem korban, a man when he shall bring of you an offering.* The original word here and elsewhere rendered 'offering,' is קרבן *korbân*, derived from the verb קרב *kârab*, signifying radically *to approach, to draw near to*, and in what is termed the Hiphil, or causative form, *to cause to approach, to bring near, to present;* hence in the Hiphil, the verb is generally rendered in our version *to offer*, a sense of the term expressly confirmed by the fact that the original words for 'bring near,' and 'offer,' are used interchangeably with each other in the following passages:—1 Chron. 16. 1, 'And *they offered* (הקריבו *yakribu*,) burnt-sacrifices and peace-offerings before God;' for which 2 Sam. 6. 17 has, 'And David *offered* (יעל *yaal*,) burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before the Lord.' In accordance with this, the noun קרבן *korban*, Gr. δωρον *gift*, is used to denote 'an offering,' or that which was *brought to the altar*, and dedicated to God, whether it was a thing animate or inanimate, a human being or a brute beast. (On the use of the word in the New Testament, Mark 7. 11, in reference to a practice condemned by our Savior, see Barnes' note, *in loc.*) Thus the bread or meat-offering, and the oblation of the first fruits, Lev. 2. 1–12, have the appellation '*korban*' given them: 'And when any man will offer a meat-offering (meal-offering,) unto the Lord, his offering (*korban*,) shall be of fine flour,' &c. So also the silver vessels, cattle, sheep, &c., offered by the princes, Num. 7. 10–17, et inf. are comprehended under the general name of '*korban.*' Nay, the very wood which was used to burn the sacrifices on the altar, Nehem. 10. 34, from its being *brought* for that purpose, is denominated '*korban.*' And what is still more worthy of notice, the same phraseology is employed in reference to the Levites as a consecrated body of men, from their being *brought near* and *presented* to the Lord for the service of the sanctuary: Num. 8. 10 'And thou *shalt bring* (והקרבת *hikrabta*,) the Levites before the Lord,' i. e. *shalt offer* them as holy persons dedicated to the service of Jehovah. As the verb קרב *kârab*, however, in its Hiphil form, denotes principally the bare *act of bringing* any thing to a particular place or person, though rendered

3 If his offering *be* a burnt-sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male [d]without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will

[d] Exod. 12. 5. ch. 3. 1, and 22. 20, 21. Deut. 15. 21. Mal. 1. 14. Eph. 5. 27. Heb. 9. 14. 1 Pet. 1. 19.

by the word 'offer,' it is to be observed, that when any private individual is said to 'offer' an animal or other oblation, it is to be understood simply of his *bringing it to the altar*, not of his performing any part of the office which was exclusively appropriated to the Priests and Levites——¶ *Ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, (even) of the herd and of the flock.* The term 'cattle' here is generic, including the 'herd' and the 'flock' mentioned in connection. The word 'even' is therefore properly supplied in our version, to indicate that 'herd' and 'flock' are exegetical of 'cattle.' The Heb. term צאן *tzon*, comprehends both sheep and goats, as is evident from v, 10. It appears, therefore, that there were only five kinds of living creatures which were accepted in sacrifice, viz. of animals: beeves, sheep, and goats, including the young of each kind of eight days old, Lev. 22. 27; and of fowls: turtle-doves and young pigeons, 1. 44. These being of the most tame, gentle, and harmless species of creatures, the most easily obtained, as well as the most serviceable to man, were well adapted at once to point out the distinguishing moral attributes of Christ and his people, those 'living sacrifices' which were 'acceptable to God,' and also to intimate man's absolute dependance upon God for those blessings to which he owes his food and raiment, the crowning comforts of life. Besides, as some of the sacrifices were followed by a feast on the victim, which was esteemed a covenant rite, therefore such animals as were allowed for food, would naturally be required to be offered in sacrifice.

3. *A burnt-sacrifice.* Heb. עלה *olah*, more correctly rendered *whole burnt-offering.* The prescribed sacrificial offerings are distinguished in Hebrew by two several terms, אשה *isheh*, and עלה *olah*, of which the first being a derivative from אש *ish, fire*, denotes an *offering by fire*, and is applied both to offerings *burnt wholly*, and to those *burnt in part.* This word is generally rendered by 'offering by fire.' The word עלה *olah*, on the other hand, literally signifying 'ascension,' from עלה *alah, to ascend*, because these offerings *went up* in flame and smoke into the air, is applied to sacrifices *wholly burnt*, which the Greeks denominated ὁλοκαυτωμαρα *holokautomata*, or ὁλοκαυστον *holokauston* from which the word 'holocaust' has been transferred into our language. If rendered in English phrase, it should properly be 'whole burnt-offering,' whereas by its being generally rendered by our translators 'burnt-offering,' the genuine distinction between the original words is hidden from the ordinary reader, as there is no difference between the expression 'burnt-offering,' and 'offering by fire.' But let the phrase 'whole burnt-offering' be employed, and the distinction is obvious. Every holocaust or 'olah,' was an 'isheh,' or *offering by fire*, but every 'isheh,' or *fire offering*, was not a holocaust. It may here be remarked, that the 'whole burnt-offering' was the first or principal sacrifice with which God was daily served by his people, Num. 28. 3, no part of it being eaten, but the whole consumed upon the altar. It pointed to the offering of the body of Christ, as is evident from Heb. 10. 10. In Deut. 33, 10, it is rendered 'whole burnt sacrifice.'—¶ *A male without blemish.* Heb. תמים *tâmim, perfect*; i. e. having neither deformity, defect, nor superfluity of members, and free from distemper. Whence the prophet says, Mal. 1. 14, 'Cursed be the deceiver who hath in his flock *a male*,

at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD.

4 •And he shall put his hand up-

• ch. 4. 15. and 3. 2, 8. 13. and 8. 14, 22. and 16. 21.

(i. e. a perfect male,) and voweth and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing,' where 'corrupt' is opposed to 'male.' This was a prefiguration of the perfect excellence of the sacrifice of Christ, who was 'a lamb *without blemish* and without spot.' 1 Pet. 1. 19. And not only so; it was doubtless designed to intimate that we are to offer to God the best of all we have; the best of our time and strength, the vigor of our days, and the utmost of our talents. Will he who would have nothing but the best of Israel's herds and flocks, be pleased with such poor remnants of our time and thoughts as may be left from the service of the world? Had the Jew brought an inferior beast, it would have been rejected by the priest, or the offering would have been void by law. Let us not suppose that the defectiveness of our spiritual oblations will be overlooked by him who searches the heart. What a man soweth, that shall he reap. Niggardly and unwilling gifts, weary and distasteful services, hasty and perturbed devotions, will find no more acceptance than the Israelite's blemished ox.—All the Burnt-offerings of beasts were to be males, but this is not prescribed in regard to the fowls.—¶ *Of his own voluntary will.* Heb. לרצנו *lirtzono, to his* (i. e. God's) *good pleasure*, or *favorable acceptance.* Thus the phrase is rendered by the Gr. δεκτον εναντι Κυριου, *acceptable before the Lord*, and the Lat. 'ad placandum sibi Dominum,' *to render the Lord propitious to him*, and thus by the Chaldee, 'that acceptableness may be to him before the Lord.' This sense is moreover confirmed by v. 4 following, and by Lev. 23. 11, 'And he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord *to be accepted for you*, (לרצנכם *lirtzonekem*),' and by Jer. 6. 20, 'Your burnt-offerings are not *acceptable* (לרצון *lerâtzon*).' Rosenmuller adopts the same construction. At the same time, the sense given in our version does no positive violence to the original, and is supported by respectable names, but we think the other decidedly preferable.—¶ *At the door of the tabernacle.* Because here in the open space of the court the altar of Burnt-offerings was placed, upon which alone, even on pain of death, these oblations were to be made. Comp. Lev. 17. 3–7. The additional phrase, 'before the Lord,' has its usual import of before the Shekinah, the visible symbol of the divine presence. By thus bringing his offering to the place prescribed, the offerer acknowledged that the Lord dwelt there in a peculiar manner, and he moreover publicly, before all the people acknowledged himself a sinner, like unto his brethren, and needing mercy no less than the vilest of the human race.

4. *Shall put his hand upon the head, &c.* From Lev. 16. 21, it is probable that by 'hand' here is implied both the hands. The act denoted that the victim offered was thereby wholly given over and devoted to God, being as it were henceforth solemnly *manumitted* from the possession of the offerer, who from this time ceased to claim any farther interest in it or control over it. It significantly intimated, moreover, the offerer's desire that his transgression might be put upon the animal thus presented, and that the death to which he now devoted it, might be instead of that death which he had himself most justly deserved. The sinner who presented the victim thus disburdened himself of the sin he acknowledged before God, and laid the weight of it upon the sacrifice. It thus taught the grand gospel doctrine of substitution.——¶ *It shall be accepted for him.* Heb. לו

on the head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be [f]accepted for him [g]to make atonement for him.

5 And he shall kill the [h]bullock before the LORD: [i]and the priests,

[f] ch. 22. 21, 27. Isai. 56, 7. Rom. 12. 1. Phil. 4. 18. [g] ch. 4. 20, 26, 31, 35, and 9. 7, and 16. 24. Numb. 15. 25. 2 Chron. 29. 23, 24. Rom. 5. 11 [h] Micah 6. 6. [i] 2 Chron. 35. 11. Heb. 10. 11.

נרצה *nirtzâh lo*, from the same root with רצון *rutzon*, above v. 3, and confirming the interpretation there given. ——¶ *To make an atonement for him.* Heb. לכפר עליו *lekappër âlauv.* This was the great purport of the appointment. In hope of this the worshipper brought his offering; through it he sought pardon and reconciliation with God; and when he offered it rightly, it became an atonement for him, not for any value of its own, but by virtue of that great sacrifice which it prefigured. The original word כפר *kâphar* signifies primarily *to cover;* not so much, however, in the sense of *wrapping* as with a garment, as in that of *smearing* or *plaistering*, it being applied, Gen. 6. 14, to the act of *coating* the ark *with pitch*. Its radical sense, therefore, is rather that of an *adhesive* than a *loose covering*. From this primary notion of *covering*, it came to be applied by metaphorical usage to the appeasing of anger, or to that act of an offending party by which he succeeds in procuring favor and forgiveness from the person or party offended. In this sense it is applied to the *appeasing* of an angry countenance, Gen. 32. 20, 'For he said, I will *appease* him, (Heb. will *cover* his face) with the present.' 2 Sam. 21. 3, 'What shall I do for you, and wherewith shall I *make the atonement* (Heb. *cover*)?' Prov. 16. 14, 'The wrath of a king is as messengers of death, but a wise man will *pacify* it (Heb. will *cover* it).' Its predominant usage is in relation to the *reconciliation* effected between God and sinners, in which sense *atonement for sin* is the *covering* of sin, or the securing the sinner from punishment. Thus when sin is pardoned, or its consequent calamity removed, the sin or person may be said to be *covered, made safe, expiated*, or *atoned*. Accordingly we find the pardon of sin expressly called the *covering of sin*, Nehem. 4. 4, 5, 'Our God give them for a prey in the land of captivity, and *cover* not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before thee.' Ps. 32. 1, 'Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is *covered*.' Ps. 85. 2, 'Thou hast brought back the captivity of Jacob; thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people; thou hast *covered* all their sin.' All such expiatory offerings pointed directly to Christ, who is the grand *atonement* or *reconciliation* for the sins of men. Dan. 9. 24. 1 John 2. 2. Heb. 10, 8, 10. The burnt-offering, it is to be observed, had not, like the sin-offering, respect to any *particular* sin, but was designed to make atonement for sin in general. Thus it is said of Job, ch. 1. 5, That he 'offered burnt-offerings, (saying,) it may be that my sons have sinned.'

5. *And he shall kill the bullock*, Heb. ושחט *ve-shâhat;* in all probably an instance of the usage very common in Hebrew, where a verb is employed in a kind of impersonal sense, equivalent to the 'on dit,' *one says* of the French, or the 'man sagt,' *id.* of the German, both of which are evidently tantamount to the passive, *it is said*. The expression before us is not intended, we conceive, to assert that the offerer, or *any one in particular*, was to kill the victim, but simply to say that one, some one, shall kill it. In conformity with this idea, the Gr. preserves the indefinite form of the expression, by rendering it σφαξουσιν *they shall slay*. A similar phraseology appears in the following passages, Gen. 11. 9, 'Therefore is *the name of it called Babel* (Heb. קרא שמו בבל *one called*

Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, [k] and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that *is by* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

6 And he shall flay the burnt-offering, and cut it into his pieces.

[k] ch. 3. 8. Heb. 12. 24. 1 Pet. 1. 2.

the name of it Babel).' Gen. 16. 14, 'Wherefore *the well was called* (קרא *one called the well*) Beer-lahai-roi.' Deut. 32. 37, 'And *he shall say* (אמר *one shall say—it shall be said*) here are their gods,' &c. Examples of this usage might be almost indefinitely multiplied, but those now adduced will probably be sufficient to confirm our rendering in the passage before us. It is highly probable that the offerer himself and the common Levites united in the act of slaughtering the animal. Indeed Patrick labors to show from Maimonides, that 'the killing of the holy things might lawfully be done by a stranger (one not of Aaron's seed), yea, of the most holy things, whether they were the holy things of private persons, or of the whole congregation.' This would appear to be confirmed by 2 Chron. 30. 17, where it is said that 'there were many in the congregation that were not sanctified; therefore the Levites had charge of the killing of the passovers for every one that was not clean;' implying that if they had been clean they would have been authorized to perform the service themselves.—¶ *Sprinkle the blood round about, &c.* This is doubtless the true sense of the original, but both the Gr. and the Lat. render it by the stronger term 'pour,' 'pour out.' The sprinkling may be supposed perhaps to have been very copious, as Maimonides tells us that the priest was to sprinkle the blood twice on the upper surface of the altar, and the rest of the blood was to be poured out at the bottom of the altar on the south side—a rite to which there is doubtless allusion, Rev. 6. 9, 'I saw under the altar (i. e. at the bottom of the altar) the souls of them that were slain for the word of God.' As the life or soul was especially in the blood, so the 'souls under the altar,' denotes the blood of the martyrs plentifully shed, and flowing as a sacrificial offering under the altar. The act of sprinkling the blood was, during every period of the Mosaic economy, exclusively the prerogative of the priesthood. It was in the effusion of blood, which is the *life*, that the virtue of the sacrifice cousisted, it being always understood that *life* went to redeem *life*. It was calculated and probably designed to remind the offerer that he deserved to have his own blood shed for his sins, and alluded moreover to the pacifying and purifying of the blood of Jesus shed for us for the remission of sins. Every reader of the New Testament knows how much our salvation is attributed to the blood of Christ; and this great evangelical truth was thus taught in shadow to the Israelites under the Law. They were by this rite most impressively taught that without the shedding of blood there was no remission of sins; and however some of them might have dim and darkened views on this subject, while the veil was upon their minds, we at least know the truth. We know that the blood of all the animals shed at the altar of burnt-offering owed all its excellency to its being a type of that blood of Jesus by which he hath obtained eternal redemption for us.

6. *He shall flay.* Gr. δειραντες *they having flayed*, shall divide,' &c. The Heb. הפשיט *hiphshit*, *one shall flay*, doubtless affords another instance of the impersonal form of speech illustrated above. The meaning is simply that those whose office it was to perform this part of the ceremony should strip the skin from the victim, and then cut up the body into its appropriate

7 And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and lay the wood in order upon the fire.

8 And the priests, Aaron's sons, shall lay the parts, the head, and the fat, in order upon the wood that *is* on the fire, which *is* upon the altar.

9 But his inwards and his legs shall he wash in water: and the priest shall burn all on the altar,

[1] Gen. 22. 9.

parts. This would seem from 2 Chron. 29. 34, to have been usually the duty of the priests; 'The priests were too few, and not able to flay all the burnt-offerings; therefore their brethren the Levites helped them.' The skin in such cases, it is to be remembered, was a part of the perquisites of the priest, Lev. 7. 8.—¶ *Cut it into his pieces.* That is, into its natural, appropriate, suitable pieces, such as head, neck, shoulders, legs, &c., or as the Gr. renders it, κατα μελη, *according to its members.* Chal. 'He shall divide it by the members thereof.' It was to be done in an orderly and systematic manner, and not confusedly. 'Why were not the greater members cut into small pieces? Because it is written, He shall cut it into the pieces thereof, and not, Shall cut it into pieces.' *Maimonides.* It is doubtless in allusion to this that the apostle says, 2 Tim. 2. 15, '*rightly dividing* (ορθοτομουντα) the word of truth.'

7. *Shall put fire.* Heb. נתנו אש *nâthenu ish, shall give fire;* by which is probably meant stirring up, cherishing, supplying fuel for, the fire that was originally kindled from heaven, and which was to be kept perpetually burning on the altar, as may be seen from Lev. 6. 11.—¶ *Lay the wood in order.* Heb. ערכו *âreku*, implying, as rightly rendered in our version, *an orderly and methodical arrangement*, and spoken of the setting or furnishing a table, and marshalling the ranks of an army, Judg. 20. 22; also metaphorically of the proper disposition of words in a prayer or discourse, Ps. 5. 4. Job, 32. 14.—37. 19

8. *Shall lay the parts.* Heb. הנתחים *hannethâhim.* As the same word is rendered in v. 6. 'pieces,' it would have conduced more to the absolute precision which ought to be consulted in every translation of the Scriptures to have preserved that rendering in the present instance. Uniformity's sake alone is often sufficient to determine a translator in his choice of one out of two or more renderings. This regular dividing and laying on of the pieces of the sacrifice was observed in all cases of the Burnt-offering. Comp. Ex. 29. 17, 18. 1 Kings, 18. 23, 33. Lev. 8. 20, 21.—9. 13.

9. *His inwards and his legs shall he wash in water.* These parts, in order that no filthy adhesions might pollute the sacred offerings, were not to be burnt upon the altar until they had been thoroughly cleansed by washing in water; a process which, according to Maimonides, was three times repeated before the ablution was thought to be complete. The typical import of this ceremony is distinctly intimated by the Apostle, Heb. 10. 22, 'Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and *our bodies washed with pure water.*'—¶ *The priest shall burn all on the altar.* Heb. הקטיר *hiktir, shall burn as a perfume,* as the original properly implies. See the import of the term fully explained in the Note on Ex. 29. 13. It is not the usual word for *consuming by fire*, and consequently we lose in our translation the peculiar expressiveness of the original, especially when taken in connexion with what follows.—'The burning

to be a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a [m]sweet savour unto the LORD.

10 ¶ And if his offering *be* of the flocks, *namely*, of the sheep, or of the goats, for a burnt-sacrifice; he shall bring it a male [n]without blemish.

11 [o]And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the LORD: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall sprinkle his blood round about upon the altar:

12 And he shall cut it into his pieces, with his head and his fat: and the priest shall lay them in order on the wood that *is* on the fire which *is* upon the altar:

13 But he shall wash the inwards and the legs with water: and the priest shall bring *it* all, and burn *it* upon the altar: it *is* a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

14 ¶ And if the burnt-sacrifice for his offering to the LORD *be* of fowls, then he shall bring his offering of [p]turtle-doves, or of young pigeons.

[m] Gen. 8. 21. Ezek. 20. 28, 41. 2 Cor. 2. 15. Eph. 5. 2. Phil. 4. 18. [n] ver. 3. [o] ver. 5. [p] ch. 5. 7. and 12. 8. Luke 2. 24.

---

and broiling of the beasts could yield no sweet savor; but thereto was added wine, oil, and incense, by God's appointment, and then there was a savor of rest in it. Our prayers, as from us, would never please; but as indited by the Spirit, and presented by Christ, they are highly accepted in heaven.'—*Trapp.* ——¶ *An offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the Lord.* Heb. עֹלָה אִשֶּׁה נִיחוֹחַ רֵיחַ *olah ishĕh rĕha nihovah, a fire-offering, an odor of rest;* or as the Gr. renders it, 'a sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savor,' which words the apostle plainly had in view in writing Eph. 5. 2, 'Christ hath loved us, and hath given himself for us *an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor.*' See note on Gen. 8. 21. Hence we learn that the *holocaust*, or *whole burnt-offering*, which, with the exception of the skin, was entirely consumed, no part of it being left even for the food of the priests, typified the sacrifice and death of Christ for the sins of the world. Chal. 'Which shall be received with favorable acceptation before the Lord.'

The Burnt-offering of the Flock.

10. *If his offering be of the flocks.* In the divine requirement of the various oblations, the circumstances of the offerers were kindly consulted. The less wealthy, who could not so well afford to offer a bullock, would bring a sheep or a goat; and those who were not able to do that were expected to bring a turtle-dove or a young pigeon. Thus it appears that the parents of our Lord, from their humble circumstances in life, brought this latter kind of offering upon the purification of Mary, Luke 2. 23–25. Indeed it will be observed throughout, that the directions respecting the poor man's offering are as minute and particular as any; intimating that God is no respecter of persons, and that his ministers are to be as anxious for the welfare, and as attentive to the interests, of the poorest of their flock, as of the most opulent.

11. *On the side of the altar northward.* If the victim had been slain on the east of the altar, where the ashes were cast, it might have obstructed the entrance to the court; on the south was the ascent to the altar, and on the west, the tabernacle; so that the north was on all accounts the most convenient quarter for this purpose, not only for the slaughter of the sheep, but also of all the other animals offered.

The Burnt-offering of Fowls.

14. *Turtle doves or of young pigeons.* From the Heb. תּוֹר *tur* (*toor*) comes the

15 And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring off his head, and burn *it* on the altar: and the blood thereof shall be wrung out at the side of the altar:
16 And he shall pluck away his crop with his feathers, and cast it [q]beside the altar on the east part, by the place of the ashes:

[q] ch. 6. 10.

17 And he shall cleave it with the wings thereof, *but* [r]shall not divide *it* asunder: and the priest shall burn it upon the altar, upon the wood that *is* upon the fire: [s]*it is* a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

[r] Gen. 15. 10. [s] ver. 9. 13.

Latin 'turtur,' and the English 'turtle,' generally rendered 'turtle-dove.' By a beautiful metaphor this bird is made by the Psalmist to denote the church: Ps. 74. 19, 'O deliver not the soul of thy *turtle-dove* unto the multitude of the enemies.' And Solomon. Cant. 2. 12, mentions the return of this bird as one of the indications of spring: 'The voice of the *turtle* is heard in our land.' Young pigeons (Heb. 'sons of the dove') were thought preferable for food to the old, whereas the full grown turtle-dove was accounted more delicious than the young. The sacrifice was ordered accordingly.

15. *Wring off the head.* Heb. מלך *mâlak.* The original term occurs only here and Lev. 5. 8, so that we are chiefly dependent upon the ancient versions for its genuine sense. The Sept. renders it by αποκνιζω, *to cut with the nail.* It probably means to make a *section* or *cut* in the head by pinching it with the fingers and nails, so that the blood might distil from the wound. In this case the head was not actually separated from the body, an idea which would seem to be confirmed by Lev. 5. 8, where it is said that the priest should 'wring off his head (Heb 'cut with the nail') but should not divide it asunder;' i. e. should not entirely separate any one part from another. Though translated 'wring,' it is to be observed that it is wholly a different word in the original from that rendered 'wrung' in the close of the verse.

16. *With his feathers;* or, *with the filth thereof.* The latter is undoubtedly the true rendering, as in the Heb. the pronominal suffix for 'his' is in the feminine gender, necessarily referring to 'crop,' and not to 'bird.' The drift of the precept is to order that the crop or maw with its contents should be cast away. This was done in order to render the sacrifice clean, and it was to be cast as far as possible from the most holy place, to intimate that all moral uncleanness was to be removed from the worship of God.

17. *Shall cleave it with the wings thereof.* That is, with the wings still remaining, though partially severed from the body. The sacrifice of birds, Maimonides observes, was one of the most difficult services of the sanctuary; and as on this account the attention of the priest was not less engrossed by the poorest sacrifice than by the most splendid, the necessity of attending to minute details in the duties of religion was strikingly inculcated.

REMARKS.—(1.) God, in his wisdom, has seen fit, for the most part to address his creatures through the intervention of mediators; and though the *moral* law was spoken in thunder and lightning from Sinai, the *ceremonial* law, pointing to the great gospel sacrifice, was given in a milder voice from the mercy seat.

(2.) Those sacrifices and offerings are peculiarly acceptable to God, which are prompted rather by voluntary impulse than by legal precept.

(2.) Although the light of nature alone may suggest to man the *duty* of worshipping the Creator, yet the *proper*

mode of rendering him homage is not left to human invention, but is matter of divine revelation.

(3.) It is fit that the offerings which are designed for the greatest and best of Beings, the infinitely perfect Jehovah, should be the best, and most perfect of their kind. 'A male without blemish.'

(4.) In all our religious services and sacrifices our faith should aim to lay its hand upon the head of the one great Atoning Victim for sin. Failing of this our offerings are of little worth.

(5.) Were it not for the solution afforded in the gospel, what an inexplicable mystery would be the whole Jewish ritual! How strange the fact that the temple of God should so much resemble a slaughter-house!

(9.) How precious in the estimation of the Most High must be the merit of Christ's sacrifice, that it should avail to convert the nauseous odor of burning flesh to a perfumed and refreshing incense!

CHAPTER II.

THE MEAT-OFFERING.

The second in the enumeration of the legal offerings, and that which occupies the present chapter is the Meat-offering. The original term is מִנְחָה *min'hah*, from the obsolete root מָנָה *mâna'h*, *to give*, *to bestow*, and is equivalent to *gift*, *present*, *oblation*. It is not exclusively, though it is predominantly, applied to religious offerings of the bloodless species made to God. In some cases, it is spoken of gifts presented to men, as Gen. 32. 13, 'And he (Jacob) took of that which he had with him *a present* (מִנְחָה) for Esau his brother.' Gen. 43. 11, 'And their father Israel said unto them, Take of the best fruits of the land in your vessels, and carry down the man *a present* (מִנְחָה).' But the present made by Jacob to Esau was of *living things*, viz. cattle, whereas that carried to Joseph was of things that had *not life*. In like manner both the offering of Cain, which was of the *fruits of the earth*, and that of Abel, which was of the *firstlings of the flock*, are each of them called 'Min'hah,' Gen. 4. 3—5. So that the word in its general import, does imply things *slain* as well as things *not slain*, although some commentators have maintained the contrary. But in ordinary usage, its meaning was restricted to an offering *made of fine flour*, whether of wheat or barley. The common rendering of the term in the English Bible by 'meat-offering' is incorrect according to the modern acceptation of the word 'meat,' which is now applied exclusively to *flesh*, although at the time when our translation was made it appears to have denoted very nearly the same as the word 'food.' A more suitable rendering therefore at the present day would be 'meal-offering,' 'flour-offering,' or even 'bread-offering,' as the flour, before it was offered, was generally, though not in every case, made into thin cakes or wafers, or something very nearly resembling bread. The materials of the Meat-offering were fine flour, with oil poured on it, and frankincense and salt added to it. The flour was either that of wheat or barley, and might be presented in the form of flour, or it might be presented after undergoing the process of baking, or frying, in the form of cakes or wafers. Sometimes the Meat-offering, instead of being made of fine flour, consisted of the first fruits of the corn. In this case the ears were to be taken when full, but yet green; to be parched or dried before the fire; the corn to be beaten out; and the offering then to be made with oil, frankincense, and salt, as before.

The Meat-offerings were either presented by themselves, or as an accompaniment to the stated burnt-offerings. In the latter case they, together with their attendant drink-offerings, were wholly consumed on the altar; but in

the former, they were burnt only in part, the remainder being given to the priests for their support. It is of *these* that the present chapter treats. The part of the offering which was burnt, together with the frankincense, was called 'the memorial' of it, for reasons which are assigned in the note on v. 2.

The meat-offerings which were not commanded by the divine law, but were the *votive* or *voluntary* oblations of individuals, were of five kinds, consisting of some preparation of flour; as

1. Fine flour unbaked.
2. Flour baked in a pan or on a flat plate.
3. Flour baked in a frying pan.
4. Flour baked in an oven.
5. Flour made into a thin cake like a wafer.

As to the leading moral design of the meat-offering, it is perhaps to be regarded as mainly a grateful acknowledgment of the bounty and beneficence of God, as manifested in those gifts of his providence to which we owe our daily bread, and the various ministrations to our physical comfort. At the same time, it is not, that we are aware, at all inconsistent with this to suppose, that it might also have had a typical purport kindred to that of most of the sacrificial offerings, which evidently pointed to Christ, and subordinately to his Church. From several passages it would seem natural to infer, that a *propitiatory* as well as a *eucharistic* meaning was couched under this ceremony; and if so, we cannot well avoid the inference that it pointed to the offering of the body of Christ as its grand realizing substance. Thus 1 Sam. 3. 14, 'Therefore I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor *offering* (מִנְחָה *min'hah*) forever.' 1 Sam. 26. 19, 'If the Lord have stirred thee up against me, let him accept (Heb. smell) *an offering* (מִנְחָה).' Therefore when Christ had come, he caused this Meat-offering as well as the slain sacrifices to cease; Dan. 9. 27, 'He shall cause the sacrifice and the *oblation* (מִנְחָה) to cease.' And of the poor man's meat offering, it is expressly said, Lev. 5. 11–13, that it should 'make atonement for sins.' From this it appears that the Scriptures join the Meat-offering with the burnt-offering as an expiation for sin; and consequently that both have a typical allusion to the atoning sacrifice of Christ. But in this the import of the Min'hah does not seem to be exhausted. It represents also the persons and services of believers made acceptable in Christ, for there is no doubt that both Christ and his Church are frequently shadowed out by the same symbolical ordinances. In accordance with this we find it said, Is. 66. 20, 'They shall bring all your brethren for *an offering* (מִנְחָה) out of all nations, &c., as the children of Israel bring *an offering* (מִנְחָה) in a clean vessel into the house of the Lord.' The accomplishment of this, the apostle intimates, is to be recognized in the results of his own ministration of the gospel to the Gentiles, Rom. 15. 16, 'That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the *offering up* (προσφορα, *oblation*=מִנְחָה) of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.' But it is not the *persons* only of believers that we behold typically set forth by this offering. Their good works, their devoted services, the fruits of their graces, are also indicated by this feature of the ancient economy. Ps. 141. 2, 'Let my prayer be set forth before thee, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening *sacrifice* (מִנְחָה).' So when the Most High assured his people, Mal. 1. 10, that he 'would not accept *an offering* at their hands,' he adds, v. 11, 'for from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gen-

CHAPTER II.

And when any will offer [a] a meat-offering unto the LORD, his

[a] ch. 6. 14. and 9. 17. Num. 15. 4.

tiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure *offering* (מנחה);' and this is fulfilled when 'men pray every where, lifting up holy hands.'—The remaining details will be given in the notes that follow.

1. *And when any will offer.* Heb. ונפש כי תקריב *venephesh ki takrib, and a soul when it shall offer;* i. e. a person or man. See note on Gen. 2. 7. as to the scriptural import of the word 'soul.' The English idiom is precisely similar. Thus we say that such a place contains so many thousand *souls;* and in such a battle, so many *souls* perished. Shakspeare also speaks of a ship swallowed in the sea, and the 'freighting *souls*' within her.—¶ *A meat-offering.* Heb. קרבן מנחה *korban min'hah, a gift-offering, a donative,* for it is to be borne in mind that the offering prescribed in this chapter was also of the votive or voluntary kind, like the animal oblations of the foregoing chapter, and therefore equally with them denominated קרבן *korbân.*—¶ *Shall pour oil upon it.* To give it a grateful relish, making it more palatable to the priests, who were to eat part of it, v. 3. Oil was to the food of the Israelites what butter is to ours. We see from this how kindly the Most High consults the gratification of his servants while ordering the provisions of his own table. But the genius of the Levitical institute requires us to look beyond this for the adequate reason for the use of oil in these rites. This substance also has a mystical or symbolical scope, as we have shown in the note on Ex. 29. 7. Its unquestionable import is, that any offering which we offer should have that *anointing* of the Holy One of which John speaks so largely in his first epistle. That oil of divine grace, that principle of holiness, which the Spirit of the Lord pours out upon the true believer's heart, is indispensable to the acceptance of our spiritual sacrifices. The *unction* of love, gratitude, reverence, holy joy, and of every gracious disposition, the fruit of the Spirit of grace, must be present to impart its virtues to our oblations, or they avail us nothing.—¶ *And put frankincense thereon.* In order to cause a sweet smell in the court of the tabernacle, which would otherwise have been offensive in consequence of the vast quantities of flesh burnt there. But this was not all. The frankincense, like the oil, had a symbolical allusion. It represented that divine mediation and intercession of Christ, by which he perfumes and renders of a sweet smell all the prayers, praises, good works, and holy affections, of his servants. He is, in the language of the Song of songs, ch. 3. 6, 'like pillars of smoke, perfumed with myrrh and frankincense, and all powders of the merchant.' That the frankincense is applicable primarily and mainly to Christ is evident from its being *wholly* consumed by fire. No part of *his* work is borne by any but himself; nothing renders our services acceptable but his atoning, justifying, interceding grace. But when this fact is cordially admitted by us, and all the favor with which we meet attributed to the merit and mediation of Christ, then our services for his honor and glory, our oblations to his priests or his poor, our works of beneficence and kindness wrought for his sake, 'come up as an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God.' As the sacrifice of Christ himself was most pleasing unto God, so are the services of all his people for Christ's sake.

offering shall be *of* fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon:

2 And he shall bring it to Aaron's

sons the priests: and he shall take thereout his handful of the flour thereof, and of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof, and the priest shall burn [b]the memorial of it upon the altar, *to be* an offering made by fire of a sweet savour unto the LORD:

3 And [c]the remnant of the meat-offering *shall be* Aaron's and his sons': [d]*it is* a thing most holy of the offerings of the LORD made by fire.

[b] ver. 9. and ch. 5. 12. and 6. 15. and 24. 7. Isa. 66. 3. Acts 10. 4.

[c] ch. 7. 9. and 10. 12, 13. [d] Exod. 29. 37. Num. 18. 9.

---

2. *Shall take thereout his handful.* Heb. וקמץ *vekamets*, shall grasp. Of this meal-offering a part only, that is to say, about an handful, was burnt, the rest being reserved for the priests' use; but all the frankincense was burnt because from it the priest could derive no advantage.——¶ *Shall burn the memorial of it.* Heb. והקטיר *hiktir*, *shall reduce it to fume or vapor, shall evaporate it*, as in the burning of incense. See the original term explained in the note on Ex. 29. 13. The part of the offering which the priest took out with his hand is called the 'memorial' of the meal or bread-offering, because it was a *remembrancer* of God's supreme dominion, a grateful acknowledgment that they held and enjoyed every thing of him as sovereign Proprietor, and by this act supplicated the continuance of it. It was designed to put him in mind, as it were, of his covenant promise to accept the services of his people rendered to him according to his commandment; in allusion to which it is said by the Psalmist, Ps. 20. 4, 'The Lord *remember* all thine offerings, and accept thy burnt-sacrifices.' Acts 14. 4, 'Thy prayers and thine alms come up for a *memorial* before God.' The sin and jealousy-offerings, on the other hand, had no oil or incense mixed with them, because they were no offerings of *gracious memorial*, but such as brought *iniquity to remembrance*, and were therefore devoid of those elements which made them come up as a sweet-smelling savor before the Lord. Comp. Num. 5. 15, Lev. 5, 11. A very prominent import of oil as a symbol is that of *joy*, and hence it was employed in all those sacrifices which had respect to righteousness, and the effects of which were attended with joy; while on the other hand it was excluded from those which had respect to sin, and the effect of which was attended mainly with sorrow.

3. *The remnant of the meat-offering shall be Aaron's and his sons'.* That is, what remains after the priest has taken his handful of the flour and the oil, with all the frankincence, this shall belong to the priests, and shall be eaten by them alone, in the court of the tabernacle, as a 'thing most holy;' whereas the less holy things, as tithes, first fruits, &c., might be eaten by their sons and daughters. Deut. 12. 5.——¶ *A thing most holy.* Heb. קדש קדשים *kodesh kodoshim*, *holiness of holinesses*, the Hebrew mode of expressing the superlative degree. A common distinction was made by the Jews between things *most holy* and the *lighter holy things*, as they termed them. Of the former class are those of which none whosoever, or none but the priests and the sons of priests might eat, and that only in the sanctuary. Lev. 6. 16–26. Such were all whole burnt-offerings, all the sin-offerings, and all the peace-offerings for the whole congregation. The 'lighter holy things' were such as might be eaten by those who were not priests in any place within the camp, and subsequently within the city of Jerusalem, as all the peace-offerings of particular individuals, the paschal lamb, the tithes, and the firstlings of cattle. In regard to the meal or bread-offering, it has been moreover suggested that a

4 ¶ And if thou bring an oblation of a meat-offering baken in the

particular sacredness attached to that from its having been designed as a type of the Christian sacrifice, or the Lord's Supper, in which it was virtually continued in the bread made of fine wheaten flour, which formed a part of that ordinance.

4. *Baken in an oven.* Heb. מאפה תנור *maëphĕh tannoon, the baking of the oven.* As there were several ways in which the bread offering, or *Min'hah* might be prepared, rules are here given applicable to these several modes; the first case being where it was baked in an oven (Heb. תנור *tannūr*), on which we subjoin an extended article from the Pictorial Bible, *in loc.* 'The ovens of a people continually on the move could have little resemblance to our own, and we can only discover what they probably were by a reference to existing usages in the East. The trade of a baker is only carried on in large towns; people bake their own bread daily in villages and encampments, and to a very considerable extent in towns also. It is evident, therefore, that when individual families bake every day so much bread only as is required for that day, recollecting at the same time that fuel is in general scarce, it is necessary that the oven should be small, and consuming but little fuel. These requisites are fully met in the common family ovens of Western Asia. That which may be considered the most general is a circular pit in the earthen floor, usually between four and five feet deep, and about three feet in diameter. This pit is well plastered within; and the dough, which is in large oval or round cakes—not thicker than pancakes, which in appearance they very much resemble when done—is dexterously thrown against the sides of the pit, which has been previously heated, and has the glowing embers still at the bottom. This cake is not turned; and, from its thinness, is completely done in two or three minutes. Its moisture being then absorbed, it would fall from the sides of the oven into the fire, were it not removed in proper time. This bread is usually flexible and soft, and may be rolled up like paper; but if suffered to remain long enough, it becomes hard and crisp on the side which has been in contact with the oven; but it is seldom suffered to attain this state, although we, who have lived for about two years on this sort of bread, thought it far preferable in this form. It is to be observed, that this pit is not exclusively an oven, but, particularly in Persia, is often the only fire-place for general purposes which is to be found in cottages, and even in some decent houses. Whether these were the 'ovens' of the Hebrews in the desert, it is difficult to determine. They are formed with little expense or labor; but are more generally found in towns and villages than among the nomade tribes of the desert. The other things resembling ovens, act more or less upon the same principle as that which we have described. They are of various kinds; but they may generally be described as strong unglazed earthen vessels, which being heated by an internal fire, the bread is baked by being stuck against the sides, in the manner already noticed. Either the interior or outer surface is used for this purpose, according to the construction of the vessel, and the description of bread required. The common bread is sometimes baked on the outside of the heated vessel; and thus also is baked a kind of large crisp biscuit, as thin as a wafer, which is made by the application of a soft paste to the heated surface, which bakes it in an instant. Of this description, no doubt, is the wafer-bread which we find mentioned in v. 4 and elsewhere. The ovens of this sort with which the writer is

oven, *it shall be* unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers [e]anointed with oil.

[e] Exod. 29. 2.

5 ¶ And if thy oblation *be* a meat-offering *baken* in a pan, it shall be *of* fine flour unleavened, mingled with oil.

---

most familiar are nearly three feet high, and about fifteen inches in diameter at the top, which is open. It gradually widens to the bottom, where there is a hole for the convenience of withdrawing the ashes. When the inside is exclusively used for baking, the outside is usually coated with clay, the better to concentrate the heat. We have seen them used under various circumstances. Even the vessels navigating the Tigris are usually furnished with one of them, for baking the daily supply of bread; and they are sometimes built to the deck for standing use. The Arab sailors have them also in their vessels on the Red Sea, and elsewhere. Sometimes a large water-vessel, with the bottom knocked out, is made to serve as a substitute, and goes by the same name. This name (*tenûr*) is as nearly as possible, the original Hebrew word תנור *tannūr*, translated 'oven' in the text. Ovens, somewhat similar, are frequently used in houses in the place of the hole in the floor already mentioned, especially in apartments which have not the ground for their floor. They are then not only used for cooking and baking bread, but for warming the apartment. The top is then covered with a board, and over this a large cloth or counterpane is spread, and the people sit around, covering their legs and laps with the counterpane. So also the pit in the floor, when not in use for cooking or baking bread, is in winter covered over, and warms the apartment, in much the same manner. It remains to add, that bread is sometimes baked on an iron-plate placed over the opening at the top of the oven. That the ovens of the Israelites in the desert were something on the principle of these earthen ovens, there is not much reason to question; and it is equally probable that those ovens which are mentioned after their settlement in Palestine were one of the two, or both the modifications of the same principle which we have described as being ordinarily exhibited in the houses of Western Asia.'—*Pict. Bib.*——¶ *Unleavened cakes.* Heb. חלות מצות *halloth matzoth*, *cakes of unleavenednesses*, an intensitive mode of expression equivalent to 'altogether unleavened.' On the import of leaven in the system of sacrifices see note on Ex. 12. 8.——¶ *Mingled with oil.* See note on Ex. 29. 2. If the cakes were made somewhat thick, the oil was poured in and mingled in the kneading; but if they were thin like a wafer, the oil was only smeared over the surface, simply to anoint the substance, but whether before or after the baking, is uncertain, though Maimonides supposes the latter.

5. *Baken in a pan.* Heb. על חמחבת *al hammahabath.* 'Dr. Boothroyd, availing himself of our now improved knowledge of the East, translates 'on a fire-plate,' instead of 'in a pan.' He is doubtless correct. In the preceding note we have mentioned a mode of baking bread on an iron plate laid on the top of the oven; but a more simple and primitive use of a baking plate is exemplified among the nomade tribes of Asia. We first witnessed the process at a small encampment of Eelauts in the north of Persia. There was a convex plate of iron (copper is often in use) placed horizontally about nine inches from the ground, the edges being supported by stones. There was a slow fire underneath, and the large thin cakes were laid upon the upper or convex surface, and baked with the same effect as when stuck to the sides of an oven; but rather more slowly. The thin wafer

6 Thou shalt part it in pieces, and pour oil thereon: it *is* a meat-offering.

7 ¶ And if thy oblation *be* a meat-offering *baken* in the frying-pan, it shall be made *of* fine flour with oil.

8 And thou shalt bring the meat-

---

bread of soft paste can be baked by the same process, which is recommended to the wandering tribes by the simplicity and portability of the apparatus. We believe that a flat plate is sometimes employed in this way, though we do not recollect to have witnessed its use. Chardin thinks that this process was in use long before ovens of any kind were known; and he is probably right. Unleavened oatmeal cakes, baked on an iron plate called a 'girdle,' are still very general in Scotland, and also in the north of England.'—*Pict. Bib.*

6. *Thou shalt part it in pieces, and pour oil thereon.* 'We here see bread, after being baked, broken up again and mingled with oil. Was this an extraordinary and peculiar preparation for the altar, or was it a preparation in common use among the Hebrews? We incline to the latter opinion, as it seems to differ very little from a common and standard dish among the Bedouin Arabs. This is made of *unleavened* paste, baked in thin cakes, which are afterwards broken up, and thoroughly kneaded with butter, adding sometimes honey, and sometimes milk, but generally employing butter alone for the purpose. This second kneading brings it into the state in which it is eaten with great satisfaction by the Arabs. The only difference between this and the preparation in the text, is the use of butter instead of oil; and in its not being said here that the bread was kneaded anew, but only that it was broken up and mingled with oil. These points of difference are not very essential. The Bedouins, as a pastoral people, have no oil; but are very fond of it when it can be obtained: butter, therefore, as used by them, may be regarded as a substitute for the 'oil' of the text. And as to the want of a second kneading in the text, it is by no means certain that such kneading did not take place, even though it is not mentioned. Besides the Bedouins do not always knead the broken bread again with butter, but are content to soak or dip the broken morsels in melted butter. It is probable that the present text explains the mingling with oil mentioned in vv. 4 and 7, better than by supposing that the paste was tempered with oil before being baked. Using oil with bread continues to be a very common practice in the East; and the Bedouin Arabs, and generally other Orientals, are fond of dishes composed of broken bread, steeped not only in oil, butter, and milk, but also in preparations of honey, syrups, and vegetable juices. Oil only is allowed in the 'meat offerings,' honey being expressly interdicted in v. 11, and this shows that the use of honey with bread was even thus early common among the Israelites.'—*Pict. Bib.*

7. *Baken in the frying-pan.* 'There is in use among the Bedouins and others a shallow earthen vessel, somewhat resembling a frying-pan, and which is used both for frying, and for baking one sort of bread. Something of this sort is thought to be intended here. There is also used in Western Asia a modification of this pan, resembling the Eastern oven, which Jerome describes as a round vessel of copper, blackened on the outside by the surrounding fire, which heats it within. This might be either the 'oven' or the 'pan' of the present chapter. This pan-baking is common enough in England, where the villagers bake large loaves under inverted round iron pots, with embers and slow-burning fuel heaped upon them. But it is probable that the fire-plate, which we have noticed under v. 5, is really intended here, and that the 'pan' there, is the

offering that is made of these things unto the LORD: and when it is presented unto the priest, he shall bring it unto the altar.

9 And the priest shall take from the meat-offering [f] a memorial thereof, and shall burn *it* upon the altar: *it is* an [g] offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

10 And [h] that which is left of the meat-offering *shall be* Aaron's and his sons'; *it is* a thing most holy, of the offerings of the LORD made by fire.

11 No meat-offering which ye shall bring unto the LORD shall be made with [i] leaven: for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering of the LORD made by fire.

12 ¶ [k] As for the oblation of the first-fruits, ye shall offer them unto the LORD: but they shall not be burnt on the altar for a sweet savour.

13 And every oblation of thy meat-offering [l] shalt thou season

[f] ver. 2. [g] Exod. 29. 18. [h] ver. 3.

[i] ch. 6. 17. See Matt. 16. 12. Mark 8. 15. Luke 12. 1. 1 Cor. 5. 8. Gal. 5. 9. [k] Exod. 22. 29. ch. 23. 10, 11. [l] Mark 9. 49. Col. 4. 6.

'frying-pan' of the present text. This seems to us very probable, as the name given by the Bedouins to this utensil is *tajen*, which is nearly identical with the name (τηγανον) which the Septuagint gives to the 'pan' in v. 5. It is useful to obtain this etymological identification of the Arabian *tajen* with one of the 'pans' of this chapter, but it is of little importance to determine which 'pan' it is. Upon the whole, the oven, the pan, and the frying-pan of vv. 4, 5, and 7, may, as it appears to us, be referred with much confidence to the clay oven, the metal plate, and the earthen vessel which we have noticed.'—*Pict. Bib.*

11. *No leaven nor any honey.* That is, as it should seem, neither *sour* nor *sweet*; nothing of the fermenting kind, which would have an unkindly effect, when eaten, upon the animal economy. But here also, we trace a moral meaning. Leaven is a well-known emblem of pride and hypocrisy. These swell the heart, and puff it up with self-importance and self-deceit. This was especially the leaven of the Pharisees, who made their prayers, and gave their alms, and did all, to be seen of men. Leaven is also used as an emblem of malice and wickedness, as we learn from the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 5. 8, 'Therefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.' Honey, in like manner, may well be considered as the emblem of the unwholesome sweetness of sensual indulgence and worldly pleasure. And these we are well assured are perfectly inconsistent with the acceptance of any offering which we may profess to bring to God. The honey of sensual gratification will make polluted and abominable any religious oblation with which it may be mixed.

12. *As for the oblation of the first-fruits, ye shall offer them, &c.* Ainsworth very plausibly suggests that this is but a continuation of the ordinance respecting the use of leaven and honey, of which, and not of first-fruits, he understands the word 'them' in this connexion. The verse contains a single exception to the rule given above. There was one case in which leaven and honey might be used, to wit, with the first-fruits. With them they might be offered, but not burnt upon the altar. This also is the interpretation of Rosenmuller.

13. *Every oblation of thy meat-offering shalt thou season with salt.* Salt is the opposite to leaven, as it preserves from putrefaction and corruption, and

was therefore used to signify the *purity* and *persevering fidelity* necessary in the worshippers of God. It was called the 'salt of the covenant,' because as salt was incorruptible, so was the covenant and promise of Jehovah, which on this account is called 2 Chron. 13. 5, 'a covenant of salt;' i. e. an everlasting covenant. But in order to obtain an adequate idea of the reasons which prompted the use of this article, and made it so indispensable in the services of the Jewish altar, we are to remember that the sacrifices were a kind of feast, in which those who partook of them were for the time being the guests of God, and eating and drinking at his table. But it was by eating and drinking together, that all important covenants were anciently ratified and confirmed, and as salt was of course never wanting at such entertainments, it came at length to be regarded as a symbol of friendship, and the phrase 'covenant of salt' was but another name for the most firm, enduring, and inviolable compact. In like manner, salt among the ancients was the emblem of friendship and fidelity, and therefore was used in all their sacrifices and covenants. No part of their religious ceremonies is more prominent than that which consists in the use of salt. Thus in Virgil, Æn. Lib. II. l. 133:

'Mihi sacra parari
Et salsæ fruges, et circum tempora vittæ.'

'For me the sacred rites were prepared, and the *salted cake*, and fillets to bind about my temples.' Servius' explanation is, 'Salt and barley, called salted meal, with which they used to sprinkle the forehead of the victim, the sacrificial fire, and the knives.' From the 'mola salsa,' *salted cake*, of the Latins, were derived the words *immolo*, *immolatio*, *to immolate*, *immolation*, and this by synecdoche came to be applied to the whole process of sacrificing. So after the salted meal it was customary to pour wine on the head of the victim, which by that ceremony was said to be *macta*, i. *magis aucta*, *augmented* or *increased*, whence the term *mactatio* in the heathen sacrifices to express the killing of the victim immediately after the affusion of the wine. But as to the sacred use of salt Homer affords several distinct allusions to it in the religious rites mentioned in the Iliad. Thus:—

'Then near the altar of the darting king,
Disposed in rank, their hecatomb they bring;
With water purify their hands and take
The sacred offering of the *salted cake*.'
Il. i. l. 584

And again:—

'Above the coals the smoking fragment burns,
And sprinkles *sacred salt* from lifted urns.'
Il. ix. l. 281.

Nearly every traveler who has visited the modern nations of the East, has furnished us with striking anecdotes illustrative of the sacredness with which salt was regarded as an emblem of fidelity in all their compacts. Thus Baron Du Tott, speaking of one who was desirous of his acquaintance, says, upon his departure, 'He promised in a short time to return. I had already attended him half way down the staircase, when stopping, and turning briskly to one of my domestics, *Bring me directly*, said he, *some bread and salt*. What he requested was brought; when, taking a little salt between his fingers, and putting it with a mysterious air on a bit of bread, he eat it with a devout gravity, assuring me that I might now rely on him.' And D'Herbelot remarks, that 'among other exploits which are recorded of *Jacoub ben Laith*, he is said to have broken into a palace, and having collected a very large booty, which he was on the point of carrying away, he found his foot kicked something which made him stumble; putting it to his mouth, the better to distinguish it, his tongue soon informed him it was a lump of salt; upon this, according to the morality, or rather superstition, of the country, where the people considered

with salt; neither shalt thou suffer [m]the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat-offering: [n]with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt.

14 And if thou offer a meat-offering of thy first-fruits unto the LORD, [o]thou shalt offer for the meat-offering of thy first-fruits, green ears of corn dried by the fire, *even* corn beaten out of [p]full ears.

15 And [q]thou shalt put oil upon it, and lay frankincense thereon: it *is* a meat-offering.

16 And the priest shall burn [r]the memorial of it, *part* of the beaten corn thereof, and *part* of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof: *it is* an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

[m] Numb. 18. 19. [n] Ezek. 43. 24. [o] ch. 23. 10, 11. [p] 2 Kings 4. 42. [q] ver. 1. [r] ver. 2.

salt as a symbol and pledge of hospitality, he was so touched that he left all his property, retiring without taking away any thing with him.'——¶ *Neither shalt thou suffer, &c.* That is, ye are not to imagine, that because the Lord's share of the offering is to be consumed by fire, and not really eaten, ye may therefore dispense with seasoning it. Every thing that is offered to him must be the best and most savory of its kind.

14. *Green ears of corn dried by the fire.* They dried them in the fire, in the green ear, because that otherwise from their moisture they would not admit of being ground in a mill.——¶ *Corn beaten out of full ears.* Heb. גרש כרמל *geres karmel, small broken corn of the green ear.* The original Heb. גרש *geres*, has the import of something *crushed, broken, pounded*, for which the Chal. has 'broken-grains,' or as we should term it, 'grits.' The Gr. renders the whole clause *νεα πεφρυγμενα χιδρα εφικτα young parched grains broken in the mill.* These first fruits had a typical reference to Christ, who is thus denominated, 1 Cor. 15. 20, and by whom all the rest of the harvest is sanctified. To the preparatory parching, breaking, and grinding, we see perhaps an allusion in the words of the prophet, Is. 53. 5, 'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was *bruised* for our iniquities.'

REMARKS.—(3.) 'The remnant of the meat-offering shall be Aaron's.' In every dispensation God has evinced a kind concern for the maintenance of those who were devoted to ministry in sacred things. Those who labor in the word are to be competently supported. 'Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? And they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar. Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.' 1 Cor. 9. 13, 14.

(8.) 'When it is presented unto the priest.' As none of the ancient sacred offerings were to be presented *immediately* to God, but were first put into the hand of the priest, and through him offered upon the altar, so spiritual sacrifices under the Gospel are not available in the sight of God, unless tendered to him through Jesus Christ, the great High Priest of the New Testament.

(11.) Especial care is to be taken not only that our religious services be cleansed from the leaven of hypocrisy, but that they be thoroughly pervaded by the 'salt' of grace. Col. 4. 6, 'Let your speech be always with salt, seasoned with grace.' Mark 9, 49, 'Every sacrifice shall be seasoned with salt.'

(14.) If the 'first-fruits' of the harvest field were of old so peculiarly acceptable to God, how much more must he be pleased now with the first-fruits of the Spirit, and the expressions of an early piety in the young. The 'green ears' of youthful devotion will naturally be followed by the ripened sheaves of a

godly old age, and in this form gathered into the garners of eternal life.

CHAPTER III.

THE PEACE-OFFERING.

Pursuing the scriptural order of the specified offerings under the law, we come in the present chapter to that which is denominated the Peace-offering. The Heb. term thus rendered is שלמים *shelâmim*, from the root שלם *shâlam*, *to make up, make good, restore, repay;* and thence *to make up a difference, to effect a reconciliation, to be at peace.* The leading ideas, therefore, conveyed by the term, are those either of *retribution* or of *peace;* and the term *peace* in the Scripture generally denotes either the *mutual concord of friends*, or *a state of prosperity.* These different senses assigned to the root have led to different expositions of the appellation derived from it. On the one hand, it is held, that the idea of *retribution*, or *recompence*, is prominent in the name given to this class of sacrifices, and that it indicates the division or distribution made of them into three parts, one for God, one for the offerers, and one for the priests. This opinion is maintained by the author of a Jewish treatise entitled סִפְרָא *Siphra*, who says, 'they were so called because a *prescribed portion* of them fell to the share of each party.' On the other hand, it is held by some, that the other sense of the root, namely, that of *concord* is dominant in the derivative, and that the name of these oblations denotes their being *symbols of friendship* between God, the priests, and the offerers, to each of whom was allotted a certain portion of them. The opinion, however, is more simple and natural and therefore more probable, which regards the combined ideas of *prosperity* and *retribution* or *requital* as prominent in the term, and that this class of offerings is so called because they were always presented in reference to a *prosperous state of affairs*, either obtained and *gratefully acknowledged*, or supplicated. A 'sacrifice of peace-offerings' therefore is properly a 'sacrifice of pay-offerings, of requitals, of retributions, or pacifications,' and was offered (1.) Upon the *recovery of peace* with God in consequence of an expiation for some sin committed; Hos. 14. 2. (2.) As an expression of *thanksgiving* for mercies received; Lev. 7. 12. Judg. 20. 26. 1 Chron. 21. 26. (3.) On the *performance of a vow*, as Ps. 56. 13, 'Thy *vows* are upon me, O God; I will *render praises* (Heb. 'will *repay* confessions') unto thee.' Prov. 7. 14, 'I have *peace-offerings* with me (Heb. 'peace-offerings are (were) upon me,' i. e. the obligation of peace-offerings); this day have I *paid my vows;*' this kind of peace-offering being *vowed* on condition that a particular mercy were bestowed, was performed after the condition was granted. By the Gr. the original word is rendered here and elsewhere *θυσια σωτηριου sacrifice of salvation, (or safety)*; though sometimes by *ειρηνικη a pacifying or peace-offering;* and by the Chal. a 'a sacrifice of sanctities (or sanctifications),' probably because none but clean and sanctified persons were permitted to eat of it; Lev. 7. 19, 20. Sol. Jarchi, a Jewish Commentator, says they are called *peace-offerings*, 'because they bring peace into the world, and because by them there is peace to the altar, to the priests, and to the owners.' This, however, is rather the effect of the expiatory than of the eucharistic offerings. Yet it is remarkable that as these sacrifices received their original appellation from their being offered in thanksgiving or supplication for *prosperity*, so because they were employed by the offerers themselves in sacred feasts, they were also very frequently designated by another name זבחים *zeba'him*, which is the appropriate term for *victims slaughtered for sacrifices and for banquets.*

Yet this is plainly a metaphorical sense of the term, by which we are in no danger of being misled. From their being principally consumed by the offerers at the feast that followed the oblation, Michaelis, Boothroyd, and others, prefer to translate the term 'feast-sacrifice' rather than 'peace-offering;' while others again choose to render the original 'thank-offering.' But we deem it best to give the most literal rendering and supply all deficiencies by the requisite explanations.

As intimated above, the Peace-offerings were of a threefold character, *voluntary*, *votive*, and *eucharistic*. The last of these was offered in view of special favors and blessings enjoyed; the two former for mercies desired and implored. In Lev. 7. 11, 12, the Peace-offering is evidently regarded as an act of thanksgiving for mercies received, and as such is referred to by David, Ps. 107. 22, 'Let them *sacrifice the sacrifices of thanksgiving* (ויזבחו זבחי תודה *yizbe'hu zib'hë todëh*), and declare his works with rejoicing.' So also Ps. 116. 16, 17, 'O Lord, truly I am thy servant, I am thy servant, and the son of thine handmaid; thou hast loosed my bonds. I will offer to thee the *sacrifice of thanksgiving* (זבח תודה *zëba'h todëh*), and will call upon the name of the Lord.' Hence it was that Hezekiah, 2 Chron. 29. 20, after having abolished all idolatrous rites, and restored the ancient worship, directed eucharistic sacrifices to be offered. Such too, it is evident, were offered by Manasseh, 2 Chron. 33. 16, after his restoration to his country and kingdom. The general doctrine held by the Jews in respect to this kind of oblations is thus expressed by Aben Ezra; 'The design of an eucharistic sacrifice is, that any person delivered from trouble may give praise to God on account of it.' Equivalent to this is the language of Sol. Jarchi; 'An eucharistic sacrifice ought to be offered to God by every one who has experienced any thing like a miracle; who has sailed over the ocean, or traveled through deserts; who has been delivered from prison, or recovered from disease; for they are under the greatest obligations to praise God.' Allusions also to the Peace-offering as a *votive* or *voluntary* oblation occur in the following passages, from which it will appear that such offerings were generally vowed in times of danger and distress. Jon. 2. 9, 'I will sacrifice unto thee with the voice of thanksgiving, I will pay that I have vowed; salvation is of the Lord.' 2 Sam. 15. 8, 'For thy servant vowed a vow while I abode at Geshur, in Syria, saying, if the Lord shall bring me again indeed to Jerusalem, then I will serve the Lord;' i. e. will serve him with a peace or thank-offering. One of the most striking instances of this kind occurs in the case of the eleven tribes, Judg. 20. 26, who from a zeal of God's house had undertaken to punish the Benjamites for the horrible wickedness they had committed. Twice had the confederate tribes gone up against the Benjamites, and twice been repulsed with the loss of twenty thousand men. But being still desirous to know and do the will of God in this matter, as it was his quarrel only that they were avenging, 'they went up to the house of God and wept and fasted until even, and offered burnt-offerings and *peace-offerings* unto the Lord;' and thus God delivered the Benjamites into their hands, so that with the exception of six hundred only, who fled, the whole tribe of Benjamin, male and females, was extirpated. So Jacob, Gen. 28. 20–22, and Jephthah, Judg. 30. 31; and so David, Ps. 66. 13, 14, 'I will pay thee my vows, which my lips have uttered, and my mouth hath spoken when I was in trouble.' From this it appears that this kind of sacrifices was very ancient, and was grafted upon that innate desire to testify a mind grateful for divine benefits, the traces of which are discoverable in all ages and all nations.

The material of the Peace-offering

was to be either of the herd or the flock, the greater or lesser animals, but never of the fowl, probably because their diminutive size did not admit of the three-fold division between God, the priest, and the people. Like the holocaustic offerings, it must be without blemish; but unlike to them, it might be either male or female. Of the rites and ceremonies pertaining to the oblation, some were in common with the other sacrifices, and some peculiar to itself. It must be brought to the door of the tabernacle; the owner must lay his hand on it; it must be killed, and the blood shed and sprinkled on the altar round about; and finally it must be burnt upon the altar, except the reserved parts. In these respects the details of the oblation are very similar to those of the burnt-offering. But peculiar to itself was the division of the offering into three parts—the limitation of the time for eating it—the addition of leaven —and the prohibition of fat and blood; each of which particulars will be duly considered in its proper place.

The victim of the Peace-offering was to be divided between God, and the priest, and the people; to each a portion. The part to be burnt 'before the Lord upon the altar, upon the burnt-offering,' consisted of all the suet pertaining to the inwards, the two kidneys, the caul upon the liver, and all the fat. This was the Lord's portion. Another was assigned to the priest. This consisted of the breast and the right shoulder. The breast was to be waved to and fro, and the shoulder was to be heaved upwards before the Lord, in token of their being appropriated to his house and service. The breast was then given to the priests in general, while the shoulder remained the perquisite of him who officiated. A portion also of the leavened bread was to be given to the priest. All the remainder of the oblation, which was by far the greatest part, belonged to the offerer himself, and was to be eaten by himself and his family and friends, if ceremonially clean, as a social and hospitable meal. If the Peace-offering were of the eucharistic class, it was to be eaten the same day it was offered, and none of it was to be left until the morning. But if the sacrifice of the offering were a vow or a voluntary offering, part of it might be eaten on the day on which it was offered, and part of it on the next day; but if any of it remained unto the third day, that part must not be eaten, but must be burnt with fire. The reason of the difference in the two cases is perhaps this: the tribute of love and gratitude was far more pleasing to God, as arguing a more heavenly frame of mind. In consequence of its superior excellence the sacrifice that was offered as a *thanksgiving* must be eaten on the same day; whereas the sacrifice offered as a *vow* or *voluntary* offering might, being less holy and acceptable, be eaten also on the second day.

As to the *occasions* on which the Peace-offerings were presented, some of them were *fixed* by divine appointment, and some were altogether *optional*. The fixed occasions were at the consecration of the priests, Ex. 29. 28; at the expiration of the Nazarite's vow, Num. 6. 14; at the dedication of the tabernacle and temple, Num. 7. 17; and at the feast of first-fruits, Lev. 23. 19. In addition to these, the people were at liberty to offer them whenever a sense of gratitude or of need inclined them to it. It is to occasions of this kind that the directions in the present chapter mainly have respect.

Having thus explained the nature of the Peace-offering, and the various rites and ceremonies connected with it, it remains to advert briefly to the moral lessons which it was calculated to impart. And in the outset we may remark, that the rendering of the original adopted in our version suggests the idea of a *pacifying* effect as wrought by this species of sacrifice, which is to be attrib-

CHAPTER III.

AND if his oblation *be* a [a] sacrifice of peace-offering, if he offer *it* of the herd, whether *it be* a male or female; he shall offer it [b]without blemish before the LORD.

[a] ch. 7. 11, 29. and 22. 21.

[b] ch. 1. 3

uted rather to the other class of offerings, whose scope was more distinctly *expiatory*. The word *peace* has a different shade of meaning in the Hebrew from what it has in our language. With us it suggests most naturally and legitimately the idea of *reconciliation, the bringing into concord contending parties,*—an idea which is more properly to be associated with the effects of the stated burnt-offering, or the occasional sin and trespass-offering. In the Hebrew the import of *prosperity, of welfare,* is predominant to the enjoyment or the petition of which this offering was especially appointed. The idea of *grateful acknowledgment* therefore is the leading idea which it is calculated to suggest. But with what expressive ceremonies was this service marked! How strongly would it tend to infuse the spirit of a son and of a friend into the heart of the worshipper. How emphatically would he be reminded of the blessed privileges which he enjoyed through his sacrifice. Partaking of the same viands was ever considered as the bond and proof of friendship and peace; and here the Lord, his priests, and the offerer himself, all partook of the same offerings. They sat down together as it were at the same table. In this rite accordingly the Jew would read a happy assurance of the divine favor towards him. As he feasted with his family and friends on the portion assigned him from the altar, he would enjoy a peace in his own soul from this instituted token of reconciliation and friendship. The whole ceremony was eminently calculated to produce all the emotions appropriate to his condition. As he brought his offering to the altar, he would think of the great mercy and condescension of God in thus providing a way of acceptance for him, and admitting him to his own friendship and love. He would feel deep abasement for the alienation and disaffection which appeared in his own heart. As he laid his hand on the animal's head, and as he saw its blood streaming at his feet, he would think of his own utter unworthiness to appear before God, and he would be affected to think that he owed all his permission to approach him to the sufferings of another in his stead. As he saw the smoke of the fat ascend to heaven, he would rejoice in this acceptance of his offering. When he looked upon the waved breast and the uplifted shoulder, he would be thankful for the ministry of the appointed servants of the Most High, and when he retired from the ceremony he would go on his way rejoicing that the Lord had accepted him in his work, and would eat his food with all the warmest emotions of gratitude, affiance, and love. Such would be the legitimate influence of a ceremony of this nature upon the heart of every pious Jew. It would be one of his most privileged feasts, though but a private one, and would throw a peaceful and happy frame over the whole soul. Thus the evangelical doctrines were presented to him, and all those right feelings towards God, which are so powerfully called forth by the gospel, were in a measure according with his light experienced by a Jew.

The Peace-offering of the Herd.

1 *If his oblation.* Heb. קרבנו *korbano, his korban or gift,* as usual in this connection wherever 'offering' or 'oblation' occurs in our version. Gr. το δωρον αυτου τῳ Κυριῳ, *his gift to the Lord.* In like manner we find 'korban' explained as *a gift* by the Evangelist, Mark 7. 11.——¶ *Male or female.* In this respect the *peace-offering* differed

2 And [c]he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation: and Aaron's sons the priests shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about.

3 And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace-offering, an offering made by fire unto the LORD; [d]the fat that covereth the inwards,

[c] ch. 1. 4, 5. Exod. 29. 10. [d] Exod. 29. 13, 22. ch. 4. 8, 9.

and all the fat that *is* upon the inwards,

4 And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* on them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away.

5 And Aaron's sons [e]shall burn it on the altar, upon the burnt-sacrifice, which *is* upon the wood, that

[e] ch. 6. 12. Exod. 29. 13.

---

from the *holocaust*, or whole *burnt-offering*, in which a male only was allowed.

2. *Shall lay his hand.* The imposition of hands in this case differed from the same ceremony in the sacrifice of the holocaust in this, that over the head of the peace-offering there was no confession of sins, but merely the uttering of praise and supplication to God.——¶ *And kill it at the door, &c.* That is the priest or some other Levite shall kill it. So also v. 8. See note on Lev. 1. 5. As this offering belonged to what were termed the *lesser* or *lighter holy things*, it was not required to be offered, like the burnt-offering or the sin-offering, on the north side of the altar, but in any place of the court. Lev. 1. 11. ——¶ *And Aaron's sons shall sprinkle.* This was to be done according to the manner prescribed, Lev. 1. 5. 'For the burnt-offering,' says Maimonides, 'the trespass-offering, and the peace-offering, the sprinkling of the blood of these three upon the altar was ever alike.' It was obviously a type of the sprinkling of Christ's blood, whereby we, our words and works are sanctified before God. 1 Pet. 1. 2, Heb. 12. 14.

3. *Shall offer of the sacrifice.* Heb. מזבח *mizzeba'h.* That is, part of the peace-offering; for of this sacrifice one part, viz. the fat pieces, the kidneys, the caul, &c., was to be burnt; a second, consisting of the breast and the right shoulder, was reserved for the priest; while all the remainder was appropriated to the offerer, to be eaten by him, his family and friends, in a sacrificial feast. ——¶ *The fat that covereth the inwards.* Frequently termed with us 'the suet.' This was always burned upon the altar, and would naturally serve to feed the fire. See a fuller explanation in the Note on Ex. 29. 13. The design of this part of the ceremony may be understood in either of the ways following. (1.) As the 'fat' of any thing is sometimes but another name for its *best* or *choicest* part (see Note on Gen. 4. 4), and as the 'fat' was deemed the most valuable part of the animal, it was offered in preference to all other parts, implying that the best of every thing was to be offered to God. (2.) As, however, the term is used in other cases to denote the dullness, hardness, and unbelief of the heart, Ps. 119. 70. Acts 28. 27, it may here signify the consuming of our corruptions by the fire of the Holy Spirit. The 'kidneys' also, the supposed seat of some of the strongest of the sensual propensities, were burnt probably to teach the duty of the mortification of our members which are upon earth, fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, &c. Col. 3. 5

4. *The caul above the liver.* See note on Ex. 29. 13.——¶ *Which is by the flanks.* Heb. כסלים *keselim, loins.* Gr. and Chal. 'Which is on the thighs.' Comp. Job 15. 27, 'He covereth his face with his fatness, and maketh *collops of fat on his flanks.* (כסל *kesel.*)'

5. *Upon the burnt-sacrifice.* That is,

is on the fire: *it is* an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

6 ¶ And if his offering for a sacrifice of peace-offering unto the LORD be *of* the flock, male or female; he shall offer it without blemish.

7 If he offer a lamb for his offering, then shall he offer it before the LORD.

8 And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it before the tabernacle of the congregation: and Aaron's sons shall sprinkle the blood thereof round about upon the altar.

9 And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace-offering an offering made by fire unto the LORD: the fat thereof, *and* the whole rump, (it shall he take off hard by the back-bone;) and the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that *is* upon the inwards,

[f] ver. 1, &c.

in addition to the burnt-offering, laying it on the altar *after* the daily offering of the lamb, which always had the precedency.

The Peace-offering of the Flock.—1. *A Lamb.*

6. *If his offering——be of the flock.* That is, of sheep or goats, which are both included under the term flock. 'Peace-offerings,' says Maimonides, 'are brought of sheep, of goats, and of beeves, male or female, and great or small; but no fowl is brought for a peace-offering.' The reason of this exception was that fowls had not fat enough to be burnt upon the altar.

9. *The whole rump.* Heb. האליה תמימה *hâalyah temimah, the perfect or entire tail.* 'Dr. Boothroyd renders, more distinctly:—'The large fat tail entire, taken off close to the rump.' It might seem extraordinary that the tail of a sheep (only of a sheep) should be pointed out with so much care as a suitable offering upon God's altar, were it not distinctly understood what sheep and what tail is intended. The direction indicates that the fat-tailed species were usually offered in sacrifice, if the flocks of the Hebrews were not wholly composed of them. This species is particularly abundant in Syria and Palestine, equalling or outnumbering the common Bedouin species. Even the latter, although in other respects much resembling the common English sheep, is distinguished by a larger and thicker tail than any British species possesses. But the tail of the species peculiarly called 'fat-tailed,' seems to exceed all reasonable bounds, and has attracted the attention of all travelers from the times of Herodotus to our own. These tails, or rather tails loaded on each side with enormous masses of fat, are often one-fourth the weight of the whole carcass, when divested of the head, intestines, and skin. The tails seem to attain the largest size in the countries with which the Hebrews were most conversant; for in countries more eastward we never saw them quite so large as the largest of those described by Dr. Russell in his 'Natural History of Aleppo.' He says that a common sheep of this sort weighs, without the offal, sixty or seventy pounds, of which the tail usually weighs fifty or upwards; but he adds, that such as are of the largest breed and have been fattened, will sometimes weigh 150 lbs., the tails being 50 lbs. These last very large sheep are kept in yards where they are in no danger of injuring their tails; but in some other places where they feed in the fields, the shepherds sometimes affix a thin piece of board to the under part of the tail, to prevent its being torn by bushes and thickets, as it is not covered underneath with thick wool like the upper part. Sometimes the

10 And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away.

11 And the priest shall burn it upon the altar: *it is* [g]the food of the offering made by fire unto the LORD.

12 ¶ And if his offering *be* a goat, then [h]he shall offer it before the LORD.

13 And he shall lay his hand upon the head of it, and kill it before the tabernacle of the congregation: and the sons of Aaron shall sprinkle the blood thereof upon the altar round about.

14 And he shall offer thereof his offering, *even* an offering made by fire unto the LORD; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that *is* upon the inwards,

15 And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away.

16 And the priest shall burn them upon the altar: *it is* the food of the offering made by fire for a sweet savour: [i]all the fat *is* the LORD's.

17 *It shall be* a [k]perpetual statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, that ye eat neither [l]fat nor [m]blood.

[g] See ch. 21. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22. and 22. 25. Ezek. 44. 7. Mal. 1. 7, 12. [h] ver. 1. 7. &c.

[i] ch. 7. 23, 25. 1 Sam. 2. 15. 2 Chron. 7. 7. [k] ch. 6. 18. and 7. 36. and 17. 7. and 23. 14. [l] ver. 16. compare with Deut. 32. 14. Neh. 8. 10. [m] Gen. 9. 4. ch. 7. 23, 26. and 17. 10, 14. Deut. 12. 16. ● 1 Sam. 14. 33. Ezek. 44. 7, 15.

---

board is furnished with small wheels, to enable the sheep to drag it along the more easily. The mutton of these sheep is very good, and the fat of the tail is the most grateful animal fat the writer ever tasted. It is rich and marrowy, and is never eaten alone, but is mixed up in many dishes with lean meat, and is in various ways employed as a substitute for butter and oil. The standing Oriental dish, boiled rice, is peculiarly palatable when lubricated with fat from the tail of this remarkable species of sheep. Viewed in its various applications, the tail is an article of great use and delicacy, and could be no unworthy offering.'—*Pict. Bib.*

11. *It is the food of the offering, &c.* We have before remarked, in speaking of the general object of the altar, that the sacrifices offered upon it were accounted, in a sense, *the provisions of God's table*, the viands upon which he feasted. See Mal. 1. 12. Such offerings are here called his 'bread,' or 'food,' and the phraseology occurs also Num. 28. 2 Ezek. 44. 7. and in Lev. 21. 6, 8, 17, the priests who burnt them are expressly said to offer 'the *bread* of their God.' The use of this language represented in a striking manner the fact that God dwelt, and, as it were, kept house among them, and that those who partook with him of these sacrifices, were entertained as guests at his table.

The Peace-offering of the Flock.—2. A Goat.

12. *If his offering be a goat.* The law concerning this offering coincides entirely with the preceding respecting the lamb, except in what relates to the rump or tail, so that this section requires very little commentary.

14. *He shall offer thereof.* That is, a part of it, the part which he immediately goes on to specify, viz. the fat, the kidneys, the caul, &c.

17. *That ye eat neither fat nor blood.* This prohibition respecting the eating of *fat*, is to be understood of the fat of such animals as were offered to God in sacrifice, and not of others, although the Jews, we believe, interpret it of all fat,

without exception. But the contrary is to be gathered from Lev. 7. 2, 'Ye shall eat of no manner of fat of ox, or of sheep, or of goat;' implying that the fat of other animals might be eaten. As to *blood*, however, the probability is, although the Rabbinical writers maintain that that of locusts, fishes, &c. was lawful, that it was intended to be universally forbidden. The prohibition in Gen. 9. 4, is absolute and unqualified; 'Flesh with the *blood* thereof shall ye not eat.' The reasons of the prohibition doubtless were, (1.) To put a difference between the chosen people and Gentile idolaters, who used to drink the blood of their sacrifices; Ps. 16. 4, 'Their sorrows shall be multiplied that hasten after another God: their *drink-offerings of blood* will I not offer.' (2.) To restrain any tendency to the acquisition of a cruel and sanguinary disposition. (3.) To inspire respect and reverence for that which was intended to represent the precious blood of Christ, in which the virtue of his atonement was to consist.

Remarks.—(1.) As the highest recompense which God requires for his benefits towards us is the tribute of a grateful heart, he that withholds this clearly proves himself unworthy of the least of heaven's mercies.

(1.) A cordial thank-offering to God should ever follow the attainment of any lawful object upon which our hearts have been set.

(2.) How kindly are we exempted from the legal burdens of the Jews! If they wished to express their humiliation or gratitude, it was at the expense of a part of their property, yielded up to God by way of sacrifice. No such necessity is imposed upon us. God hath not made us 'to serve with an offering, nor wearied us with incense.' It is the offering of a free heart, or of a 'broken and contrite spirit,' that he desires of us, and that he will accept in preference to 'the cattle upon a thousand hills.' All that remains for us is to say, 'Accept, I beseech thee, *the free-will offerings of my mouth*.' If we withhold these, well may we fear that every beast that was ever slaughtered on these occasions, and every portion ever offered, will appear in judgment against us, to condemn our ingratitude and obduracy!

(5.) 'Shall burn it on the altar, upon the burnt-sacrifice.' The Peace-offering, whether presented in a way of thanksgiving or supplication, equally began with a sacrifice *in the way of atonement*. Thus, whatever be the frame of our minds, and whatever service we render unto God, we are invariably to fix our thoughts on the atonement of Christ, as the only means whereby our persons or our services can find acceptance with God.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SIN-OFFERING.

The Jewish law prescribed two kinds of piacular sacrifices distinguished in our language by the appellations *Sin-offering* and *Trespass-offering*—terms which, though not adequately expressing the force of the original words, we are obliged to retain for the want of better. The original for *Sin-offering* is חטאה *hattâh*, or חטאת *hattâth*, the strict rendering of which is *sin*, but which is by metaphorical usage employed to denote a *sin-offering*. So in like manner אשם *âshâm* rendered *trespass-offering* properly and primarily signifies *trespass*. In accordance with this usage the apostle, 2 Cor. 5. 21, says God 'made him (Christ) to be *sin* (*αμαρτιαν a sin-offering*) for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God.' The Gr. word here used by the apostle is the same by which the Septuagint in more than eighty places in the Pentateuch translate the Heb. word חטאה *hattâh*, *sin*, which in all these places our English version renders *sin-offering*. Yet

it is at the same time proper to observe that the term *may* be taken in this connexion as an abstract for the concrete, and simply imply that God treated the Savior *as if he were a sinner*.

The distinction of these two kinds of offerings is exceedingly difficult to be determined. In Lev. 5. 5, 6, the terms are used as signifying precisely the same thing, and in the 11th and 12th verses the Trespass-offering is thrice mentioned as a Sin-offering. The explanation suggested by Michaelis, Jahn, Gesenius, and others, viz. that sin-offerings were presented for offences of *commission*, and Trespass-offerings for those of *omission*, has of late perhaps been most generally received. Yet it fails on examination to yield entire conviction; for some offences mentioned among trespasses, (as Lev. 5. 2, 3.) are as much of a positive nature, as any of the transgressions indicated in a general way as requiring to be expiated by Sin-offerings; and the very occasion of a Trespass-offering (Lev. 5. 17–19.) is described in language which most strictly applies to a *positive* violation of law. Nor can we well make the distinction consist in the offence having been committed *unawares* in the one case, and not in the other; for if the person bound to present a Sin-offering, is uniformly described as one who has 'sinned through ignorance,' the same too is the character of transgressions mentioned in connexion with Trespass-offerings, Lev. 5. 2, 3, 15. On the whole, whatever the distinction was, it does not seem to have been of much importance; and Winer, (Realwörterbuch), after a pretty full discussion of the subject, which is to be found translated in J. P. Smith's 'Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ,' remarks, that as none of the previous solutions are satisfactory, and 'as in the statements of the law itself nothing is contained that can in any measure conduct us safely to a determination upon the difference between the Sin-offering and the Trespass-offering, it seems best entirely to renounce making a distinction.' By which he probably does not mean that there *was* no distinction, but that at this day it is very difficult, if not impossible, to discover it.

The difficulty lies in great measure in in this, that the Sin-offering seems to have respect to a lighter species of sin, and yet to require the more solemn offering; whilst the Trespass-offering relates to considerably heavier offences, and yet admits of an easier method of obtaining forgiveness. This is evident from the fact, that in the Trespass-offering pigeons or turtle-doves might be offered, or in case of extreme poverty a measure of flour; but in the Sin-offering no such abatement or commutation was allowed. But then there were some peculiarities attaching to the Trespass-offering which may perhaps afford a solution to this apparent anomaly, and which we shall advert to after stating the principal points of difference between the two. (1.) They differed in the *occasions* on which they were offered. The Sin-offerings, it appears, were presented on account of something done amiss through *ignorance* or *infirmity*, while the Trespass-offering would seem rather to have been for sins committed through *inadvertence*, or *the power of temptation*, and under circumstances which appear to admit of less apology than the preceding. Among the latter were sins of great enormity, such as violence, fraud, lying, and even perjury itself, Lev. 5. 1, 4,—6. 2, 3. There must of course be very different degrees of criminality in these sins, according to the degree of information the person possessed, and the degree of conviction against which he acted. It might be that even in these things the person had sinned through ignorance only; but whatever circumstances there might be to extenuate or aggravate his crime, the Trespass-offering was the appointed means whereby he was to obtain mercy and forgiveness.

(2.) They differed in the *circumstances* attending them. In the Sin-offering there was a particular respect to the rank and quality of the offender. If he were a priest, he was to offer a bullock; which was also the appointed offering for the whole congregation. If he were a ruler or magistrate, he must offer a kid, a male; but if he were a common individual, a female kid or lamb would suffice. In the Trespass-offering, no mention is made of a bullock for any one, but only of a female kid or lamb, of turtle-doves or young pigeons, or in the event of a person's not being able to afford them, he might offer about five pints of flour, which would be accepted in their stead, Lev. 5. 6, 7, 11. This is the excepted case to which Paul refers when he says, Heb. 9. 22, '*Almost* all things are by the law purged with blood'

Now thus far it does appear that the heavier sins were to be atoned for by the lighter sacrifices; but then there were three things required in the Trespass-offering which had no place in the Sin-offering, viz.: confession of the crime, restitution of the property, and compensation for the injury. Suppose a person had 'robbed God' by keeping back a part of his tithes, whether intentionally or not, he must, as soon as it was discovered, present his offering, confess his fault, restore what he had unjustly taken, and add one fifth more of its value, as a compensation of the injury he had done, Lev. 5. 5.—6. 5. The same process was to take place if by fraud or violence he had injured a man, Num. 5. 6–8. This gives a decided preponderance to the Trespass-offering, and shows that the means used for the expiation of different offences bore a just proportion to the quality of those offences. We do not affirm that this observation clears up all the difficulty respecting the distinction of the two kinds of offerings, but that it removes some part of it we think there can be no doubt.

The Sin-offerings were of two kinds, the *greater* and the *less*. The *greater* were offered, (1) When the high-priest had committed an offence, and thereby brought guilt upon the whole nation. In this case he was required to bring the greatest of all the sacrifices, a young bullock, because he was the least excusable of all men if he knew not the law of God, or heedlessly did any thing contrary to it. This victim he was to bring to the door of the tabernacle, lay his hand upon its head, and kill it before the Lord. A part of the blood was then *jetted* with his finger seven times towards the separating veil or curtain of the sanctuary, a part of it was sprinkled on the altar of incense, and the remainder poured out on the ground at the foot of the altar of burnt-offerings. The inward fat was then to be burnt upon the altar, but the skin and all the remaining parts were to be carried out and burnt without the gates of the camp or city. (2.) When the whole nation had committed an offence through ignorance, and afterwards repented. In this case the offering was the same, a young bullock without blemish, upon which the elders of the congregation were to lay their hands, and then the victim was to be slain, and the same ceremonies used in the disposal of the blood, as in the similar offering of the priest. (3.) On the great day of atonement for the high-priest and the nation. The ceremonies, which were more numerous and imposing than usual, will be detailed in the notes on the 16th ch., where we have treated at full length of the two-fold ordinance of the sacrificial and the scape goat.

The *lesser* kind of Sin-offerings were brought in the following cases. (1.) When a magistrate or ruler committed an offence through error, which afterwards came to his knowledge. His sacrifice was then to be a kid of the goats without blemish, whose blood

CHAPTER IV.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, [a]If a soul shall sin through ignorance against any of

[a] ch. 5. 15, 17. Num. 15. 22. &c. 1 Sam. 14. 27. Ps 19. 12.

was partly smeared upon the altar, and partly poured upon the ground. The fat pieces only came to the altar; the rest fell to the priest. Lev. 4. 22–26. (2.) When a private person sinned through ignorance. The sacrifice prescribed was a ewe or a female kid. (3.) When a woman was purified from a long-continued hemorrhage; or, after child-birth, had reached the time of purification. Lev. 12. 6, 8.—15. 25–30. (4.) When one had a running issue, as mentioned Lev. 15. 2, 14, 15. (5.) When a Nazarite had touched a corpse, or the time of his vow was completed. Num. 6. 10, 14. (6.) On the consecration of a priest or Levite. Lev. 9. 23. Num. 8. 8, 12. (7.) On the purification of a leper. Lev. 14. 19–31. The other details of the offering will be noticed as we proceed.

In contemplating the institution of the Sin-offering, the strongest impression perhaps which we receive from it is that of guilt and responsibility attaching, in the sight of God, to sins of infirmity and ignorance; for it is to such that it mainly has respect. We are prone to imagine that an offence committed unintentionally or unawares, cannot incur the charge of guilt. Men do not scruple to plead their ignorance, their infirmities, their natural and habitual propensities in excuse for their misdeeds. But the law of God determines otherwise. It enjoins an onerous ceremony for the expiation of sins unconsciously committed. The sin, it is true, is not so great as if it were done knowingly, wilfully, and presumptuously; yet still it is sin, and as such needs an atonement. Without the shedding of blood there was no remission. At the same time we are not to lose sight of the consolation which flows through this typical ordinance to the bosom of the penitent believer. The language of the Apostle, Heb. 13. 11–13, makes it evident that the Sin-offering pointed directly to Christ, through whose efficacious atonement all his sins, whether of greater or less aggravation, are cancelled and abolished. It is those daily infirmities, those sins unconsented to, and yet committed; those faults too covert for detection, or too late detected; it is they that constitute his daily struggles, and wage within him an unceasing warfare. And when he has seen the sins of his wilful alienation borne away by the atoning sacrifice, these cleaving vestiges of a corrupt nature will often vex him with painful fears, lest there should still be a demand of wrath against him. How appropriate then is this exhibition of a continual offering for our continual need! 'He that knew no sin was made sin (a sin-offering) for us.' Here we have pardon; not once, to cancel the past debt and begin on a new score; but pardon daily, hourly renewed, as often as the Sin-offering is pleaded before the Father, is brought in faith, and laid upon the altar before the Lord. We do nothing well. If we pray, it is with cold and wandering thoughts; if we hear, it is with distracted and forgetful minds; we are continually surprised, continually overtaken, continually turned aside by the current of temptation, that runs so strong against us, when perhaps we cannot convict ourselves of one indulged, deliberate sin. Therefore did the God of mercies ordain this peculiar institution, prefiguring to them of old the divine oblation to be once offered, but forever efficacious, for the pardon of this and every kind of guilt.

the commandments of the LORD *concerning things* which ought not to be done, and shall do against any of them:

3 [b]If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the

[b] ch. 8. 12.

1. *The Sin-offering for the Anointed Priest.*

2. *Shall sin through ignorance against any of the commandments.* Heb. נפש כי תחטא בשגגה מכל מצות *nephesh ki tehetâ bishgâgâh mikkol mitzvoth a soul when it shall sin through inadvertently erring from any of the commandments.* The true construction is, not 'sinning against,' but 'erring from,' as the phraseology in the original is in effect the same with that in Ps. 119. 10. 'Let me not *wander from* (אל תשגני *al tashgëni*) thy commandments.'——¶ *Through ignorance;* i. e. unadvisedly, unwittingly, unawares. The Heb. שגגה *shegâgâh*, here used, comes from שגה *shâgâh, to go astray, to err, to transgress through mistake, ignorance, or inadvertency.* In the Greek it is sometimes rendered by *αγνοια ignorance*, but here, and frequently elsewhere, by *ακουσιως unwillingly*, the exact opposite to *εκουσιως willingly* or *wilfully*, occurring Heb. 10. 26, and opposite also to what the law, Num. 15. 57, 30, terms *sinning with a high hand*, or *presumptuously.* The import of the term is fully disclosed, Num. 35. 11, where mention is made of 'killing a person *at unawares;*' Heb. שגגה *shegâgâh, by error, unwittingly*, which, in the parallel passage, Deut. 19. 14, is expressed by *ignorantly*, or literally, *without knowledge;* both which terms, for greater explicitness, are joined together in Josh. 20. 3, 'The slayer that killeth any person *unawares* (בשגגה *bishgâgâh, by error*), and *unwittingly* (i. e. without knowledge),' which is also opposed to a 'lying in wait,' i. e. with a set purpose and intention to kill; Deut. 19. 11. Ex. 21. 13. The Apostle, Heb. 9. 7, denominates such sins *αγνοηματα ignorances*, or *ignorant trespasses*, more fully explained, Heb. 5. 3 by two distinct words, where he speaks of the duty of priests 'to have compassion on the *ignorant*, and on them that are *out of the way.*' These ignorances or errors therefore occurred when any one, through not knowing, or forgetting, or not duly heeding the law, and impelled rather by a casual infirmity, than by a settled intention, committed some foul act which God had forbidden. In such cases, as soon as the transgression came to the knowledge of the offender, he was required to offer the sacrifice here prescribed; and not to think that ignorance or inadvertency was an excuse for his sin. But he, on the other hand, who sinned presumptuously, and with an avowed contempt of the law and the law-maker, was to be cut off, and *there remained no more sacrifice for the sin*, Heb. 10. 26, 27.——¶ *And shall do against any of them.* Heb. ועשה מאחת מהנה *veâsâh mëahath mëhënnah, shall do of (any) one of them.* Gr. *ποιηση ἐν τι απ' αυτων, shall do any one thing of them.* The phrase 'do against' does not perhaps materially vary from a correct rendering, but the obvious idea of the original is the *doing of* something which *ought not to be done.* The Jewish writers insist on the following circumstances relative to the sin mentioned in the text. (1.) Its being committed through ignorance, or mistake, or involuntarily. (2.) Its being against some *negative* command. (3.) Its including *facts*, not *words* or *thoughts*, as appears from the expression, 'and shall *do* against any of them.' (4.) Its consisting of such *facts* as, if perpetrated willingly, would subject the offender to a כרת *kereth*, or capital cutting off.

3. *The priest that is anointed.* That is, the High Priest, as rendered both in

people; then let him bring for his sin which he hath sinned, [c] a young bullock without blemish unto the LORD for a sin-offering.

4 And he shall bring the bullock [d] unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before the LORD.

5 And the priest that is anointed [e] shall take of the bullock's blood,

[c] ch. 9. 2. [d] ch. 1. 3, 4.

[e] ch. 16. 14. Numb. 19. 4.

the Gr. and Chal.; for the High Priest only was, thus honored. Lev. 21. 10. 16. 32. Ex. 29. 29. Thus, as the apostle says, 'The law made those high priests who had infirmity, and who needed daily to offer up sacrifices, first, for their own sins, and then for the people's;' but our High Priest, Christ Jesus, was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens. —— ¶ *Sin according to the sin of the people.* Heb. לאשמת העם *leashmath hââm, to the guilt of the people*, i. e. so as to cause the people to transgress and bring guilt upon themselves, by emboldening them in iniquity by his pernicious example, or involving them, in virtue of the intimate relation subsisting between priest and people, in the consequences of his guilt. Thus 1 Chron. 21. 3, 'Why then doth my Lord require this thing? Why will he bring *a cause of trespass* (לאשמה *leashmah*) to Israel?' where the word rendered 'cause of trespass,' is the same with that occurring here, and rendered 'sin.' Gr. *του τον λαον αμαρτειν so that the people sin.* Vulg. 'delinquere faciens populum,' *so as to make the people to offend.* Chazkuni, a Jewish commentator, explains it thus: 'To make the people guilty, in that he hath taught and permitted them to do a thing forbidden.' —— ¶ *A young bullock.* Heb. פר בן בקר *par ben bâkâr, a young bullock*, by which is meant one little larger than a calf. It would almost seem that there was ground for the remark made by some, that in great offences the sacrifices were *comparatively* small, lest it should be imagined that pardon was obtained by the value of the offering. Here the word employed is פר *par*, properly *a calf*, while the victim in the peace-offering was שור *shor, an ox*, though rendered less strictly in our version *a bullock.* —— ¶ *Let him bring for his sin——for a sin-offering.* The same original word חטאה *haltah, sin*, is used in both cases. This, as we already remarked, is the name both for *sin* and the *sin-offering;* as the word *piaculum* was among the heathen, which signified both a great crime and the expiatory sacrifice for it. See Rom. 8. 3. 2 Cor. 5. 21, where the word *αμαρτια sin*, is used in the same manner.

4. *Shall lay his hands, &c.* In the trespass-offering and other sacrifices of this nature, confession was joined with the imposition of hands; but in the sin-offering it is not mentioned, though some commentators have supposed it was implied. But we prefer to adhere to the simple letter of the record. But that the offering was, or ought to have been made in a penitent, believing, and imploring frame of spirit, there can be no doubt. 'Neither reconciliation-day (Lev. 16.), nor sin-offering, nor trespass-offering do make atonement, saving for them that repent and believe in their atonement.'—*Maimonides.* Another of the Jewish writers (Nitzachon, p. 11) observes, 'When a man sacrificed a beast he was to think, 'I am more a beast than this present; for I have sinned, and for the sins which I have committed, I offer this animal; though it were more just that he who sinned should suffer death than this beast.' Wherefore by this sacrifice a man was led to begin his repentance.'

and bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation:

6 And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the LORD, before the vail of the sanctuary.

7 And the priest shall [f]put *some* of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the LORD, which *is* in the tabernacle of the congregation; and shall pour [g]all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of the burnt-offering, which *is at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

8 And he shall take off from it all the fat of the bullock for the sin-offering; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that *is* upon the inwards,

9 And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away,

10 [h]As it was taken off from the bullock of the sacrifice of peace-offerings: and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of the burnt-offering.

11 [i]And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung:

[f] ch. 8. 15, and 9. 9, and 16. 18. [g] ch. 5. 9.

[h] ch. 3. 3, 4, 5. [i] Exod. 29. 14. Numb. 19. 5.

5. *And bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation.* By which is meant that it should be brought *into* the very sanctuary, as appears from what follows. The preposition אֶל *el*, might indeed properly have been rendered *into*, as in the cases mentioned in the Note on Ex. 28. 30. Gr. εις την σκηνην *into the tabernacle.*

6. *Sprinkle of the blood seven times.* A mystical number, signifying the *full* and *perfect* cleansing of sin, and carrying with it also an implication of the aggravated heinousness of the offence as committed by a priest; for this, it appears, was peculiar to this sacrifice for sin, and to that for the whole congregation. We do not read of its being adopted in any other case. It was to be sprinkled towards the vail of the sanctuary, where the Lord, who was to be propitiated, dwelt, and from this ceremony being practised in no other instance save in that of the congregational offering, it would seem to imply that in respect to offences of this nature, there was *peculiar need* of the offerer's having recourse to that 'blood of sprinkling,' which could alone speak peace to his conscience. The restoration of the divine favor was not so easily obtained. He must *struggle* for it. He must urge the plea of atoning blood again and again.——¶ *Before the vail of the sanctuary.* Heb. את פני פרכת הקדש *eth penë paroketh hakkodesh, and before the vail of holiness.* Gr. κατα το καταπετασμα του αγιου *before the holy vail.* The clause is plainly exegetical of the preceding 'before the Lord,' which is equivalent to 'before the Shekinah,' and this we know had its residence in the holy of holies, just behind the separating vail between the two apartments, called in Heb. 9. 3, 'the second vail.'

7. *And the priest shall put, &c.* This also was peculiar to this sacrifice, and to that for the whole congregation, v. 17. The blood was thus applied to each horn or spire of the incense-altar, probably to intimate that no intercessions or prayers would be accepted from the sinner till he was absolved from his guilt by virtue of the atoning blood.——¶ *Shall pour all the blood;* i. e. all that is left after the sprinkling. It could not be absolutely *all*, but the quantity of blood sprinkled in the sanctuary was so small, that the remainder might, without impropriety, be termed the whole. During the Israelites' residence in the wilderness, it is probable they

12 Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, [k]where the ashes are poured out, and [l]burn him on the wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt.

[k] ch. 6. 11. [l] Heb. 13. 11.

had receptacles under ground with conveyances to carry off the blood. After the building of the Temple, there were two holes, one on the west side of the altar, the other on the south, by which the blood was conveyed into a subterranean channel, communicating with the brook Kedron.

12. *Shall he carry forth without the camp.* Heb. הוֹצִיא *hotzi, he or one shall carry forth;* undoubtedly an instance of that indefinite or impersonal form of expression, so common in Hebrew, where the singular, like the French 'on dit,' *they say*, has the import of the plural. And thus it is rendered both here and in v. 21, by the Gr. ἐξοισουσιν, *they shall carry forth.* So in v. 24, our version renders 'in the place where *they* kill the burnt-offering,' when the original is ישחט *yish'hat, he or one kills.* This is an idiom of very extensive use and of the utmost importance in the sacred writings. See it more fully illustrated in the Note on Lev. 1. 5. This precept has a primary reference to the state of the Israelites during their wandering in the wilderness. After their settlement in Canaan and the erection of the Temple at Jerusalem, they carried them out of the city. The sacrifice, now considered as having the sin of the priest transferred from himself to it, by his imposition of hands, was become unclean and abominable, and was carried as it were out of God's sight. The ceremony, therefore, was strikingly significant of the sinfulness of this sin. The fat portions only of the victim, with the kidneys and caul, after being detached from the rest were to be burnt upon the altar. No other part was to come near the altar, nor was the least share of it permitted to either priest or people, but it was to be carried out of the camp skin and all entire, and burnt in a fire on the ground. By this was denoted the offerer's being in a state of guilt, wholly unworthy to communicate with God, and like the offering itself, *deserved* to be excluded the society of his people, till reconciled by the sacrifice now made in his stead. Thus Christ, who was made sin or a sin-offering for us, 'suffered *without the gate.*' Even this slight accordance of the type and the antitype serves to show how completely all the grand observances of the law had their realization in him.——¶ *Burn him on the wood with fire.* Not upon an altar, but on a fire made with wood upon the ground, to show the odiousness of the sin. As the whole burnt sacrifices were burnt on the altar because they were an 'offering of sweet-smelling savor to God,' so this was burnt without the camp upon the ground to show that the odor of it was ungrateful and abominable.——¶ *Where the ashes are poured out.* There were two places where the ashes were poured, one by the side of the altar where they were first laid, of which mention is made Lev. 1. 16; the other, without the precincts of the camp, to which, as to a general receptacle, the ashes and other refuse matter of the camp was conveyed. The publicity here given to the burning of the sin-offering of the priest, might be intended to convey a deeper impression of the enormity of his sin compared with that of the common people, although the same thing was commanded in case the whole congregation had sinned. There was, therefore, a peculiar reproach attached to this sacrifice, intimated by the repetition of the present order—from the offence upon which it was founded.

13 ¶ And [m]if the whole congregation of Israel sin through ignorance, [n]and the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly, and they have done *somewhat against* any of the commandments of the LORD *concerning things* which should not be done, and are guilty;

14 When the sin which they have sinned against it is known, then the congregation shall offer a young bullock for the sin, and bring him before the tabernacle of the congregation.

15 And the elders of the congregation [o]shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the LORD: and the bullock shall be killed before the LORD.

[m] Numb. 15. 24. Josh. 7. 11. [n] ch. 5. 2, 3, 4, 17. [o] ch. 1. 4.

16 [p]And the priest that is anointed shall bring of the bullock's blood to the tabernacle of the congregation:

17 And the priest shall dip his finger *in some* of the blood, and sprinkle *it* seven times before the LORD, *even* before the vail.

18 And he shall put *some* of the blood upon the horns of the altar which *is* before the LORD, that *is* in the tabernacle of the congregation, and shall pour out all the blood at the bottom of the altar of the burnt-offering, which *is at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

19 And he shall take all his fat from him, and burn *it* upon the altar.

[p] ver. 5. Heb. 9. 12, 13, 14.

2.—*The Sin-offering for the Whole Congregation.*

13. *If the whole congregation sin.* This probably refers to some oversight in acts of religious worship, or to some transgression of the letter of the law committed, not presumptuously, but heedlessly, as in the case mentioned 1 Sam. 14. 32; where, after smiting the Philistines, the Israelites 'flew upon the spoil, and took sheep, and oxen, and calves, and slew them on the ground: *and the people did eat them with the blood.*' This was a congregational sin. The sacrifices and rites in this case were the same as in the preceding; only here the elders laid their hands on the head of the victim, in the name of all the congregation.——¶ *And the thing he hid from the eyes of the assembly.* Heb. הקהל *hakkâhal*, the word properly answering to our English word *church*, as it is well rendered by Ainsworth. Accordingly Stephen says of Moses, Acts 7. 38, 'This is he that was *in the church* in the wilderness with the angel that spake to him.' By 'the things being hidden from their eyes,' is meant that they were not for the present sensible of their error or transgression. The reference is to a case where they had ignorantly or inadvertently committed some act which they presumed at the time to be lawful, but which subsequent reflection or instruction convinced them was sinful. In this case, as soon as they came to a sense of their wrong-doing, the elders, or heads of the tribes, as the representatives of the whole body, were to bring a young bullock to the tabernacle and present it to the high-priest, who was to offer it by way of atonement for them, in the same manner and with the same circumstances, that he did the other for himself.

15. *The elders shall lay their hands.* Not the priests in this case, but the heads and magistrates of the nation, who were seventy in number. As all the people could not lay their hands upon the bullock, it was sufficient that it were done by the elders, or a part of them, in the name of the congregation. Maimonides says, that the number of elders that officiated on this occasion was three. This act denoted the faith of the people in a coming Messiah, 'up-

20 And he shall do with the bullock as he did [q]with the bullock for a sin-offering, so shall he do with this: [r]and the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them.

21 And he shall carry forth the bullock without the camp, and burn him as he burned the first bullock: it *is* a sin-offering for the congregation.

22 ¶ When a ruler hath sinned, and [s]done *somewhat* through ignorance *against* any of the commandments of the LORD his God *concerning things* which should not be done, and is guilty;

23 Or [t]if his sin, wherein he hath sinned, come to his knowledge; he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a male without blemish:

24 And [u]he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat, and kill it in the place where they kill the burnt-offering before the LORD: it *is* a sin-offering.

25 [x]And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out his blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering.

26 And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, as [y]the fat of the sacrifice of peace-offerings: [z]and the priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.

[q] ver. 3. [r] Num. 15. 25. Dan. 9. 24. Rom. 5. 11. Heb. 2. 17. and 10. 10, 11, 12. 1 John 1. 7. and 2. 2. [s] ver. 2. 13. [t] ver. 14.

[u] ver. 4, &c. [x] ver. 30. [y] ch. 3. 5. [z] ver. 20. Num. 15. 28.

---

on whom the Lord would lay the *iniquity of us all.*' Is. 53. 6.

3.—*The Sin-offering for the Ruler.*

22. *When a ruler hath sinned.* Heb. נָשִׂיא *nâsi, prince,* i. e. *one preferred, elevated, advanced above others;* from נָשָׂא *nâsâ, to lift up.* It is a common appellation both of supreme and subordinate rulers, and is very frequently used to signify *the head of a tribe.* The Jews understand it peculiarly of the *head or prince of the great Sanhedrim,* who was the king himself, while they were under kingly government; but it seems more reasonable to understand it of all the great officers or magistrates; any one who held any kind of political dignity among the people. ——¶ *And is guilty, or if his sin come to his knowledge;* i. e. if he is presently reminded of it by the checks of his own conscience, or if after a time it be suggested to him by others. The ceremonies in this case differed from those in the case of the offering of the anointed priest, inasmuch as the blood of the ruler's sin-offering, which was a kid of the goats instead of a bullock, was not to be brought into the tabernacle, but was all to be bestowed upon the brazen altar, nor was the flesh of it to be burnt without the camp; which intimated that the sin of a ruler, though worse than that of a common person, was not so heinous as of that of the high priest, or of the whole congregation.

25. *Put it upon the horns of the altar.* In every sacrifice for sin the horns of one or other of the altars were required to be touched with the blood, but with this difference, that in the sacrifice for the sins of the high priest and the people, when the blood of the victim was brought into the sanctuary, the horns of the altar of incense were sprinkled, in others, those of the altar of holocaust.

26. *He shall burn all his* (i. e. its) *fat upon the altar.* Nothing is here said, as in the case of two of the previous offerings, v. 12, 21, which were to be burnt without the camp, of the disposal that should be made of the flesh of the the victim. But in Lev. 6. 26, 29, and Num. 18. 9, 10, the prescribed law of

27 ¶ And [a]if any one of the common people sin through ignorance, while he doeth *somewhat against* any of the commandments of the LORD *concerning things* which ought not to be done, and be guilty;

28 Or [b]if his sin which he hath sinned come to his knowledge; then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female without blemish, for his sin which he hath sinned.

29 [c]And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering.

30 And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar.

31 And [d]he shall take away all the fat thereof, [e]as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace-offerings; and the priest shall burn *it* upon the altar for a [f]sweet savour unto the LORD: [g]and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him.

32 And if he bring a lamb for a sin-offering, [h]he shall bring it a female without blemish.

33 And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay it for a sin-offering in the place where they kill the burnt-offering.

34 And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar:

35 And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat of the lamb is taken away from the sacri-

[a] ver. 2. Num. 15. 27. [b] ver. 23. [c] ver. 4. 24. [d] ch. 3. 14. [e] ch. 3. 3. [f] Exod. 29. 18. ch. 1. 9. [g] ver 26. [h] ver. 28.

---

the Sin-offering is, that the priest and his sons should eat it in the sanctuary, and no where else; provided that they were free from uncleanness.

4.—*The Sin-offering for one of the common people.*

27. *If any one of the common people.* Heb. אם נפש אחת מעם הארץ *im nephesh ahath mëam hûâretz, if one soul of the people of the land;* i. e. as rightly rendered, any of the common people, whether private Israelite, priest, or Levite, with the exception of the high priest and ruler mentioned above.

28. *A kid of the goats.* This was the ordinary sacrifice prescribed on such occasions; but when the poverty of the offerer prevented such an oblation, one of less value was appointed; Lev. 5. 11, 12. The ceremonies were nearly the same as in the preceding cases.

31. *For a sweet savor unto the Lord.* Although this phrase is used concerning the burnt-offering and the peace-offering, yet it is nowhere said of the foregoing sin-offerings; 'the reason of which,' says Bp. Patrick, 'I am not able to give, unless it were to comfort the lowest sort of people with the hope of God's mercy, though their offerings were mean compared with those of others.'

33. *And slay it for a sin-offering in the place where they kill the burnt-offering.* Here again the Gr. gives correctly the plural form σφαξουσιν *they shall slay*, just as our translation in the same clause renders ישחט *yish'hat*, though singular, *they kill, they are accustomed to kill.*

35. *According to the offerings made by fire unto the Lord.* Heb. על אשי יהוה *al ishë Yehovah;* which may be rendered, *upon, with,* or *beside the offerings made by fire;* i. e. in addition to the burnt-offerings which were daily consumed upon the altar. As for the flesh

fice of the peace-offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, [i]according to the offerings made by fire unto the LORD: [k]and the priest shall make an atonement for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him.

[i] ch. 3. 5. [k] ver 26, 31.

---

or bodies of this and the foregoing Sin-offering of the rulers, they were not, like those of the high priest and the congregation, burnt without the camp, but were eaten by the priests, as directed, Lev. 6. 26–30.

REMARKS.—(2.) Sins of ignorance, though of less guilt than sins of presumption, do as really need the blood of atonement, and as truly form the matter of repentance, as any others.

(2.) From the fact that greater sacrifices and more burdensome rites were appointed for the priest and the prince than for private persons, it is evident that the sins of some men are of a more heinous character, more scandalous and pernicious, than those of others. Persons occupying a public station, which makes them conspicuous, cannot sin with impunity, however it may be with others.

(13.) As there might be among the people of Israel a sin of the whole congregation, so at the present time there may be a sin of the whole nation, which needs, as it were, a national atonement.

(28.) 'If his sin come to his knowledge.' Whenever conscience charges upon us former sins committed, whether agnist God or man, we are bound to make restitution, though years may have elapsed since the event occurred.

CHAPTER V.

THE TRESPASS-OFFERING.

The original word for *Trespass-offering is* אשם *âshâm*, from a root of the same letters אשם *âsham*, *to fail in duty, to transgress, to be guilty*, or, as it is for the most rendered in our version *to trespass*. The leading idea is plainly that of *guilt*, and it is extensively admitted by lexicographers that the degree of guilt denoted by the term is greater than that denoted by the word חטא *'hâtâ*, *to sin*, from which comes the appropriate term for *sin-offerings*.

The Trespass-offerings, as we have already remarked, so greatly resembled the Sin-offerings, that it is by no means easy to distinguish between them. The occasions on which they were offered were much the same, and the ceremonies much the same also. Indeed, we sometimes have the same oblations called interchangeably *Sin-offerings* and *Trespass-offerings*, as particularly Lev. 5. 6–8: 'And he shall bring his *trespass-offering* (אשמו *ashâmo*) unto the Lord *for his sin which he hath sinned*, (על חטאתו אשר חטא *al 'hattâtho asher 'hâtâ*) a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin-offering. And if he be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his *trespass which he hath committed* (אשמו אשר חטא *ashâmo asher 'hâtâ*) two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, unto the Lord; one *for a sin-offering* (לחטאת *lehattâth*) and the other for a burnt-offering.' Here it is observable that the offence committed is called indifferently a *sin* and a *trespass*, and the sacrifice offered, a *trespass-offering* and a *sin-offering*. Notwithstanding this there were marked points of difference between the two. Sin-offerings were sometimes offered for the whole congregation; Trespass-offerings never but for particular persons. Bullocks were sometimes used for Sin-offerings, never for Trespass-offerings. The blood of the Sin-offering was put on the horns of the altar; that of the Trespass-offering was only sprinkled round about the bottom of the altar. Still we are left in ignorance of the precise nature of the distinction, or for what *reasons* the law in one case pre-

scribed one, and in another the other. Lightfoot, guided by rabbinical authority, makes the difference to consist in this, that both indeed were offered for the same sort of transgressions, but the אשם *âshâm*, or *trespass-offering* was to be offered when it was doubtful whether a person had transgressed or not; as for instance, suppose that he had eaten fat, and was afterwards in doubt whether it was the fat belonging to the muscular flesh, which was lawful to be eaten, or the fat of the inwards, which was unlawful; then he was to offer an אשם *âshâm*. But if it were certain, and he knew that he had trespassed, he must offer the חטאה *hattâah*, or *sin-offering*. Maimonides is of opinion that the offences for which the אשם *âshâm* was offered were inferior to those for which the חטאה *hattâah* was offered. Bochart, on the other hand, and we think with much better reason, holds that the offences expiated by אשם *âshâm* were more grievous than those expiated by חטאה *hattâah*. Aben Ezra makes חטאה *hattâah* to signify a sacrifice offered for purging offences committed through ignorance of the law; אשם *âshâm* for such as were committed through forgetfulness of it. Others again make the difference to be, that the חטאה *hattâah* was for offences proved by witnesses; the אשם *âshâm* for secret faults known to others only by the offender's confession. But against all these hypotheses very specious objections may be urged, and it is therefore to the following that we are disposed to give the preference.

It is contended, and we think upon very plausible grounds, by several distinguished critics, that the class of offences to which the word אשם *âshâm* is applied, although ultimately committed against God, were yet always, or generally, such as involved an injury towards one's neighbor; and in this sense they affirm that our English word *trespass* is its most suitable representative. It is certain, as a matter of fact, that *most* of the offences which were to be expiated by the Trespass-offering were of this character. Indeed, Outram, whose authority on this subject is perhaps of more weight than that of any other writer, observes that in *all* cases where the אשם *âshâm* was required, there was some wrong or injury done to a neighbor, except in the case of the Nazarite defiled by the dead, Num. 6. 12, and of the leper, Lev. 14. 12. Still we cannot positively affirm that this is the designed import of the term, and are obliged therefore to leave the matter enveloped more or less in that cloud of obscurity which, as we have already remarked in the introduction to the preceding chapter, rests upon the distinction between the Sin and the Trespass-offering. Thus much however is clear, that the class of offences for which the Trespass-offering was to be brought included those which, though not amounting to *wilful* and *presumptuous* acts, were yet usually committed *against knowledge*, and were therefore of a higher grade of guilt than the sins of mere ignorance and infirmity which were contemplated by the Sin-offerings. Several such are mentioned in the commencement of this chapter, viz. the concealing of any part of the truth by a witness properly adjured; the touching any unclean person or thing; and the swearing rashly that he would do what might be sinful, or what he might not be able to perform. In all these cases a female lamb or kid was to be offered, and confession made of guilt. The ceremonies of oblation were precisely the same as those of the Sin-offering, except that the blood, instead of being put upon the horns of the altar, was to be sprinkled round about the altar. If the offender was too poor to give a lamb, he was to bring two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, the one for this particular sin which burdened his conscience, the other for a burnt-offering for his sins in general; making expiation first for that in which he had more

immediately offended. If even this was beyond his means, the tenth part of an ephah of flour, or about five pints, might be substituted.

Another class of offences to which this offering had reference, was that in which some trespass was committed ignorantly or undesignedly against the holy things of the Lord, Lev. 5. 15 compared with Lev. 22. These were things dedicated to the Lord under the ceremonial law, or prescribed or prohibited by its rules, and were very numerous. Thus if one had unwittingly kept back any of the required offerings, or had eaten within his private gates the tithes that belonged to the priests, or had failed to sanctify the firstlings of the males; in these cases he was to bring as a Trespass-offering a ram without blemish. But besides this, he was to make restitution, with the addition of the fifth part, according to the estimate formed by the priest. Nay, if he even only *suspected* that he had offended in any of these holy things, he was to bring the ram as a Trespass-offering, and to pay the estimated value, but without the addition of the twenty per cent.

A third class of offences were those of a somewhat deeper dye—certain open and wilful injuries and violations of law, such as thefts, violence, false-swearing, deceit and fraud. 'If a soul sin and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie against his neighbor, &c.' Thus if one denied what had been committed to his trust, or dealt fraudulently in any concern of partnership, or took any thing away by open violence, or secretly deceived his neighbor to his loss, or denied having found that which was lost; in all these cases the delinquent must bring a ram for a Trespass-offering, and must pay the value, estimated by the priest, of the injury done, with the addition of the fifth part thereof. Doing thus, it was said that 'the priest should make an atonement for him before the Lord, and it should be forgiven him for any thing of all that he hath done in trespassing therein.'

On the general subject of the Sin and Trespass-offerings we may remark, that while the purpose and design of these various ceremonies have been disclosed so far as they can convey moral or spiritual knowledge to our minds, there is doubtless much in the external forms that must be referred to the sovereign will of God. No other satisfactory reason can be assigned for the requirement in certain cases of one of these species of offerings rather than another, than that it was the divine pleasure so to have it. In the ordinances before us it is clear, that the wilful sins for which a ram was the largest offering required were greater than those infirmities for which a bullock was demanded. If the atonement had really lain in the type, this would have borne almost an appearance of injustice. But as it was no doubt intended by every kind of expiation to fix the attention upon the Great Atonement thereafter to be made for all sin, the intrinsic value of the particular offering was a matter of comparatively little importance. Indeed it is very conceivable, as we have already remarked, that a sacrifice of less value may have been ordained for sins of greater enormity with the express purpose of conveying the intimation that the atoning virtue was not in the sacrifice, but in the better blood which was to be shed at a future day on Calvary. Compared with this every typical prefiguration, even the most costly that could be devised fell so infinitely short in value, that it might have been a special aim of divine wisdom to ordain a less in order the more forcibly to impress upon the mind the intrinsic inefficacy of a greater.

But while it was not especially important for the worshipper to know why one animal was chosen to expiate one sin, and another another, it *was* important for him to know that for every par-

CHAPTER V.

AND if a soul sin, [a]and hear the voice of swearing, and *is* a witness, whether he hath seen or known *of it;* if he do not utter *it*, then he shall [b]bear his iniquity.

[a] 1 Kings 8. 31. Matt. 26. 63.

[b] ver. 17. ch. 7 18, and 17. 16, and 19. 8, and 20. 17 Numb 9. 13.

ticular sin there was a remedy provided; so that no man need incur the divine wrath, either by reason of his most secret faults or his most flagrant violations of the law. This is the very essence of gospel truth. No sin, not even the smallest or most unintentional, could be forgiven without a sacrifice. But no man need await the judicial punishment. As soon as he knew his fault, or suspected it, he had his remedy. He knew what he was to do. If he did it not the condemnation that ensued was self-procured. It was not the fault of the law, nor the fault of the judge, nor the fault even of his own natural weakness or infirmity, if the evil he had committed was not forgiven him. This is the gospel. Whatever men may think of their natural condition as an extenuation of their sins; however they may venture to impugn the justice that assures their punishment; this at least cannot be gainsayed—the remedy is provided; the atonement is made known; the mode of making it personably available is clearly stated; it is efficacious for every sin; it is within the reach of every sinner. Christ by his one oblation has made satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. If any man chooses to abide the consequences of his transgressions, rather than seek forgiveness in the way prescribed, the condemnation is his own deliberate choice.

Various offences of Infirmity or Inadvertence for which the Trespass-offering was prescribed.

1—*In concealing Knowledge.*

1. *And hear the voice of swearing.* Heb. ושמעה קול אלה *veshâmeâh kol âlâh, and hear the voice of adjuration, execration,* or *oath.* That is, when one is adjured or put upon his oath as a witness of any fact which is brought into legal question. The precept does not, it would seem, relate to the duty of informing against a common profane swearer, but to the case of one who is summoned to give evidence before the civil magistrate. Judges, among the Jews, had power to adjure not only the witnesses, but the person suspected (contrary to the criminal jurisprudence of modern times, which requires no man to accuse himself), as appears from the high priest's adjuring our Savior, who thereupon answered, though he had before been silent, Mat. 26. 63, 64. So the apostle says, 1 Thess. 5. 27, 'I charge (adjure) you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.' Now if a person 'heard the voice of swearing,' i. e. if he were adjured by an oath of the Lord to testify what he knew in relation to any matter of fact in question, and yet through fear or favor refused to give evidence, or gave it but in part, he was to 'bear his iniquity;' i. e. to bear the punishment of his iniquity, if he repented not and brought not the appointed sacrifices It seems to be implied that such an one should be considered in the sight of God as guilty of the transgression which he has endeavored to conceal, as may be inferred from Prov. 29. 24, 'Whoso is partner with a thief, hateth his own soul: he heareth cursing and bewrayeth it not;' i. e. he hears the words of the magistrate adjuring him, and binding his soul under the penalty of a 'curse' to declare the whole truth, yet he 'bewrayeth,' or uttereth it not; he persists in wickedly stifling his evidence and concealing the facts; surely such an one is a 'partner' with the culprit, and by exposing himself to the consequences

2 Or [c]if a soul touch any unclean thing, whether *it be* a carcass of an unclean beast, or a carcass of unclean cattle, or the carcass of unclean creeping things, and *if* it be hidden from him; he also shall be unclean, and [d]guilty.

3 Or if he touch [e]the uncleanness of man, whatsoever uncleanness *it be* that a man shall be defiled withal, and it be hid from him; when he knoweth *of it*, then he shall be guilty.

4 Or if a soul swear, pronouncing with *his* lips [f]to do evil, or [g]to do good, whatsoever *it be* that a man

[c] ch. 11. 24, 28, 31, 39. Numb. 19. 11, 13, 15. [d] ver 17. [e] ch. 12. and 13. and 15.

[f] See 1 Sam. 25. 22. Acts 23. 12. [g] See Mark 6. 23.

---

of thus withholding the truth, may be justly said to 'hate his own soul.'——¶ *And is a witness.* The Hebrew canons speak of four different kinds of oaths; (1.) The oath of pronouncing a thing (of which see v. 4); (2.) Vain or rash oaths (forbidden Ex. 20. 7); (3.) the oath concerning that which was delivered to keep; (4.) the oath of witness, here mentioned. This they explain as follows; 'As when witnesses can give testimony concerning goods, and the owner requireth them to witness, and they deny that they can give testimony, and swear that they cannot, &c., for such an oath they are to bring the sacrifice here appointed.'—*Maimonides.*——¶ *Whether he hath seen or known of it.* That is, whether it be a matter which has come under his own personal knowledge, or which he has learnt from the information of others. The spirit of the precept seems to require a *voluntary* rendering of testimony when it was known that information was sought, as well as a true and faithful declaration when summoned by legal process.——¶ *He shall bear his iniquity.* Heb. ונשא עונו *venâsâ avono.* The whole clause *may* perhaps be rendered, 'If he do not utter it, *and* shall bear his iniquity,' i. e. shall consequently remain subject to the wrath of God, and liable to condign punishment; implying that this is a part of the sinful condition embraced under the hypothetic particle '*if*,' which is not an improbable sense. And so in respect to the final clause of the three ensuing verses, we may regard it as a mere continuation of the *conditional* language of the verse, and not as *declarative* of the divine sentence respecting the offender. This declaration or appointment is reserved to the 5th and 6th verses, where the corresponding duty is enjoined. In the original each of these clauses is introduced by the particle 'and,' which would seem to have been improperly omitted by our own and most other translators.

2.—*In touching an unclean Thing.*

2. *If a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be, &c.* That is, either the *dead* body of a *clean* animal, or the *living* or *dead* body of an *unclean* creature. All such persons were required to wash themselves and their clothes in clean water, and were considered as unclean until evening, Lev. 11. 8, 24. 31. ——¶ *If it be hidden from him.* That is, if he be not aware of the uncleanness which he has contracted, and goes on to do those things which he would not be at liberty to do, provided he were conscious of his defilement, such as entering the tabernacle or eating of holy things, then when he comes to be acquainted with the fact he shall look upon himself as 'unclean,' just as if he knowingly touched the unclean thing, and consequently excluded from divine worship till he had offered the sacrifice appointed v. 6.

3.—*In touching an unclean Person.*

3. *Or if he touch the uncleanness, &c* These different kinds of uncleanness are afterwards specified in detail, Lev 11–15, where see Notes.

shall pronounce with an oath, and it be hid from him; when he knoweth *of it*, then he shall be guilty in one of these.

5 And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these *things*, that he shall [h]confess that he hath sinned in that *thing*:

h ch. 16. 21. and 26. 40. Numb. 5. 7. Ezra 10. 11, 12.

4.—*In taking a rash Oath.*

4. *If a soul swear, pronouncing with his lips, &c.* That is, when a man swears rashly that he will or will not do such and such a thing, as David, that he would kill Nabal; Jepthah, that he would sacrifice to the Lord whatsoever should meet him coming out of his doors, &c. The original word בטא *bâtâ*, rendered *pronounce*, has the import of *rashly, inconsiderately*, or *foolishly uttering any thing*, as may be seen, Ps. 106. 33, where it is said of Moses that 'he *spake unadvisedly* (Heb. רבטא *yebatta*) with his lips.' So Prov. 12. 18, 'There is that speaketh (Heb. בטא *botë*, *speaketh rashly*) like the piercings of a sword.' Thus also Num. 30. 6, 8, the phrase 'uttered ought with her lips,' is in Heb. מבטא *mibta, the rash or incautious utterance of the lips.* From the Heb. root is probably formed the Gr. *βαττος battos*, and *βαττολογια battologia, rash, vain, heedless speaking*, which occurs Mat. 6. 7, 'But when ye pray use not *vain repetitions* (Gr. *βαττολογια battologia*) as the heathens do;' i. e. do not indulge in rash or inconsiderate professions; speak not unadvisedly to your Maker in prayer, either in making vows or promises, whatever may be the warmth of your devotions. The import of the precept is doubtless the same as that contained Eccl. 5. 2. 'Be not *rash* with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God.' The present rendering, 'vain repetitions,' does not seem to be warranted by sufficient authority.—As to the law itself, 'it served very effectually,' says Michaelis, 'to maintain the honor of oaths, inasmuch as every oath, however inconsiderate, or unlawful, or impossible, was considered so far obligatory, that it was necessary to expiate its non-fulfilment by an offering; and it was at the same time, the best possible means of weaning the people from rash oaths, because the man who had become addicted to that unbecoming practice, would find himself too frequently obliged either to keep his oaths, how great soever the inconvenience, or else to make offerings for their atonement.'—*Comment. on Laws of Moses*, v. 4, p. 111.——¶ *And it be hid from him.* It supposes that he did not rightly understand or duly consider the circumstances of his swearing, as whether the object were lawful, or the performance of it in his power. If these matters were 'hidden from him,' or he was not properly *aware* of them, he was bound to atone for the hastiness and rashness of his oath by a sacrifice. ——¶ *Then he shall be guilty in one of these.* Rather, '*and* he shall be guilty in one of these,' i. e. one of the three cases above propounded.

5. *When he shall be guilty in one of these things.* That is, in one of the four sins just mentioned. The words seem to be merely a repetition of the final clause of the preceding verse.—— ¶ *Shall confess.* At the same time laying his hands on the head of the victim, in token of his faith in the great atoning sacrifice. The offering was not acceptable unless accompanied with a penitential confession, and an humble prayer for pardon. The form of the confession was substantially this: 'I have sinned; I have done iniquity; I have trespassed, and have done thus and thus; and do return my repentance before thee; and with *this* I make atonement.' The animal was then considered to bear vicariously the sins of the person who brought it.

6 And he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the LORD for his sin which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin.

7 And [i]if he be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass which he hath committed, two [k]turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, unto the LORD; one for a

[i] ch. 12. 8. and 14. 21. [k] ch. 1. 14.

6. *He shall bring his trespass-offering.* Heb. אשמו *ashâmo*, which may be rendered *guilt-offering*, as the original אשם *asham* properly signifies *guiltiness* or *trespass*, just as the word rendered 'sin-offering,' ch. 4, literally signifies *sin* or *transgression*. The one as well as the other pointed to Christ, of whom it is said, Is. 53. 10, 'Thou shalt make his soul an *offering for sin* (אשם *asham, a guilt or trespass-offering*).' ——¶ *The priest shall make an atonement for him.* As the atonement was not accepted without his repentance, so his repentance would not justify him without the atonement. In regard to the excellent uses of this feature of the general system of Levitical laws, we cite the remarks of Prof. Palfrey:—'If an offence were committed in ignorance, the offender, it is true, would not be culpable, except for having neglected to inform himself concerning the character of his act. But his sin done unawares might injure his neighbor as much as if it had been committed against light; and society is interested in preventing that ignorance of the law among its members which allows them to do it harm. He who had unintentionally transgressed a law, then, being called on, as soon as he came to know the illegality of what had been done, to put himself to expense because of it, found himself addressed by a motive to avoid such a mistake in future; in other words, to acquaint himself with the law. The presumptuous offender was punished, in the form of a Sin or Trespass-offering, by a fine, by which he 'made atonement,' just as in our day, a man has made his atonement, or his reconciliation, with the society whose laws he has violated, when he has served out the time of his sentence in prison, or paid the prescribed pecuniary penalty. To a man who had offended without detection, except by his own conscience, the system would have an admirable application. It would never suffer his conscience to sleep, till he had informed against himself. It would be perpetually addressing him with the offer to restore him to a fair standing, and to self-respect, as soon as he would come forward, avow his offence, present his offering, or (to phrase it differently) pay his fine, and make restitution to those whom he had injured, if the case was such, as to admit of this being done. And, once more, the system was of excellent influence in putting the legal penalty of fine in the form of a religious offering. The wrong-doer, while he gave satisfaction to the state, and paid the fine of his delinquency, was thus reminded, that it was not only against the state that he had offended, and was at the same time made to express the penitence of his heart to God.' —*Lect. on Jew. Antiq. vol.* 1, *p.* 250.

7. *And if he be not able to bring a lamb.* Heb. אם לו תגיע ידו דו שה *im lo taggia yâdo dĕ sĕh, if his hand reach not to the sufficiency (or value) of a lamb.* This was ordained that the means of atonement might be within the ability of all classes. In reference to these offerings, Maimonides says, 'If a poor man brought the oblation of the rich, he was accepted; but if the rich brought the oblation of the poor, he was not accepted.' Pigeons were so plenteous in Palestine and the neighboring countries, that he must have been poor indeed, who could not afford a pair.

sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering.

8 And he shall bring them unto the priest, who shall offer *that* which *is* for the sin-offering first, and [l]wring off his head from his neck, but shall not divide *it* asunder:

9 And he shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin-offering upon the side of the altar; and [m]the rest of the blood shall be wrung out at the bottom of the altar: it *is* a sin-offering.

10 And he shall offer the second

[l] ch. 1. 15. [m] ch. 4. 7, 18, 30, 34.

for a burnt-offering, according to the [n]manner: [o]and the priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him.

11 ¶ But if he be not able to bring two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons; then he that sinned shall bring for his offering the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin-offering; [p]he shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put *any* frankincense thereon: for it *is* a sin-offering.

12 Then shall he bring it to the

[n] ch. 1. 14. [o] ch. 4. 26. [p] Numb. 5. 15.

Adrichomius, the traveler, tells us that there was a single tower to the south of Jerusalem, in which 5000 doves nestled. Maundrell also remarks of Kefteen, in Syria, that 'the adjacent fields abounding with corn give the inhabitants great advantage for breeding *pigeons*, insomuch that you here find more dove-cotes than other houses.' ——¶ *One for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering*; it being necessary for the sinner first to have his peace made with God by the sin-offering, in order to have his burnt-offering or gift accepted.

8. *Wring off his head.* Rather 'pinch or nip the head with the nail,' as explained in the Note on Lev. 1. 15. It does not appear that the head was to be quite separated from the body.

10. *According to the manner.* Heb. כמשפט *kammishpât, according to the judgment*, i. e. according to the *ordinance* or *statute*; the original term משפט *mishpât* being used to signify the *prescribed mode* of doing any thing, particular in the matter of religious services. ——¶ *For his sin.* Heb. מחטאתו *mē'hattatho, from his sin*; i. e. cleansing him from it.

11. *But if he be not able to bring two turtle-doves.* The kind consideration of the ability and circumstances of the offender, which distinguishes all these statutes, appears very conspicuous here. If any one were so impoverished that even an offering of two or three birds were not easily within his reach, then a slight oblation of flour was acceptable in its stead. But while we admire the graciousness of heaven in this respect, let us not fail to observe that the offence was invariably to be followed by *some kind* of atonement, in order to generate habits of the utmost vigilance and circumspection in all their deportment. 'God may be represented,' says R. Levi, 'as declaring in this precept, It is not my will that such things should be done; but if any man commit them through frailty, let him repent heartily, and keep a stricter guard over himself in future. Let him offer sacrifices which may serve to imprint the remembrance of his guilt on his mind, and likewise to prevent him from offending again.' The prescribed offering in this case was the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, or about three quarts, as the ephah contained a little more than seven gallons and a half. This was to be offered without oil, not only because that would make it too costly for the poor, but because it was a sin-offering, and therefore to show the loathsomeness of the sin for which it was offered, it must not be grateful either to the taste by oil, or to the smell by frankincense.

priest, and the priest shall take his handful of it, [q]*even* a memorial thereof, and burn *it* on the altar, [r]according to the offerings made by fire unto the LORD: it *is* a sin-offering.

13 [s]And the priest shall make an atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in one of these, and it shall be forgiven him: and [t]*the remnant* shall be the priest's, as a meat-offering.

14 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

15 [u]If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance, in the holy things of the LORD; then [x]he shall bring for his trespass unto the LORD a ram without blemish out of the flocks, with thy estimation by shekels of silver, after [y]the shekel of the sanctuary, for a trespass-offering:

16 And he shall make amends for the harm [z]that he hath done in the holy thing, and [z]shall add the fifth part thereto, and give it unto the priest; [a]and the priest shall make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass-offering, and it shall be forgiven him.

17 ¶ And if a [b]soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the com-

[q] ch. 2. 2. [r] ch. 4. 35. [s] ch. 4. 26. [t] ch. 2. 3. [u] ch. 22. 14. [x] Ezra 10. 19. [y] Exod. 30. 13. ch. 27. 25. [z] ch. 6. 5. and 22. 14. and 27. 13, 15, 27, 31 Numb. 5. 7. [a] ch. 4. 26. [b] ch. 4. 2.

12. *Shall take his handful of it.* Heb. קמץ ממנו מלוא קמצו *kâmetz mimmenu melo kamtzo, shall grasp of it the fulness of his grasping.* This was peculiar to all the meat-offerings, that a handful as a memorial should be burnt on the altar, while the remainder was eaten by the priests, except in the case of the priests' own offerings of this kind, which were *all* burnt, as appears from Lev. 6. 16, 22, 23.——¶ *According to the offerings.* See Note on Lev. 4. 35.

13. *In one of these.* That is, by one of these *three* before mentioned sacrifices, either that of a lamb, or of two turtle-doves or young pigeons, or of fine flour. Rashi observes that as there were three classes of men, the rich, the poor, and the very poor; so there are three kinds of offerings prescribed in this chapter, adapted to the circumstances of these several classes.

5.—*For a Trespass committed through Ignorance.*

14. *If a soul commit a trespass.* Heb. תמעל מעל *timal maal, trespass a trespass.* The original word is different from that which has hitherto been rendered *trespass*, and has mainly the import of *prevaricating* or *dealing fraudulently*, especially in matters of religion. ——¶ *In the holy things of the Lord.* As for instance by not paying his full tithes; by neglecting to consecrate or redeem the first born; by appropriating to his own use the first-fruits; or by eating any of those parts of the sacrifice which pertained to the priests. This was a *trespass;* an offence which it is here supposed might be done through mistake, forgetfulness, or want of care or zeal; for if it were done presumptuously, in contempt of the law, the offender died without mercy, Heb. 10. 28.——¶ *With thine estimation.* Or, 'with thy valulation.' That is, with so much money as should be an adequate satisfaction for the wrong done to the priest. This estimation was to be made by the priest, as appears from Lev. 27. 8, 12. Or it may mean, as the ancient versions generally understood it, that the ram should be at least of the value of two shekels, the plural for the dual.——¶ *After the shekel of the sanctuary.* See Note on Ex. 30. 13.

6.—*The Doubtful Trespass.*

17. *If a soul sin, &c.* In order still

mandments of the LORD; c though he wist *it* not, yet is he d guilty, and shall bear his iniquity.

18 e And he shall bring a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass-offering unto the priest; f and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his ignorance wherein he erred and wist *it* not, and it shall be forgiven him.

19 It *is* a trespass-offering: g he hath certainly trespassed against the LORD.

c ver. 15. ch. 4. 2, 13, 22, 27. Ps. 19. 12. Luke 12. 48. d ver. 1. 2. e ver. 15. f ver 16. g Ezra 10. 2.

more effectually to deter the chosen race from all irreverence towards any thing peculiarly dedicated to God and his service, it is here enacted, that if any one sinned in regard to the use of things which he only *suspected* to be sacred—about which he was left in *suspense* whether he had offended or not—even in this case, that he might be sure of being on the safe side, he was to bring his ram as a tresspasser, and pay the value of the thing according to the priest's estimation, as ordered v. 15, only with this difference, that the additional prescribed *fifth part* was here to be dispensed with, inasmuch as there was some uncertainty whether he had actually transgressed or no. It would perhaps seem, from the letter of the two passages, that the case here mentioned was the same with that in the preceding ch., v. 27, yet the different offerings prescribed seem to preclude this idea. In the former case the sacrifice appointed was a kid of the goats or a female lamb; but in the present, an unblemished ram was prescribed. The previous passage, moreover, is to be understood of *moral prohibitions*, of things concerning others; this on the other hand, has respect to *ceremonial precepts* touching sacrifices or other things pertaining to divine worship.

REMARKS.—(1.) We are not to account our duty discharged merely by avoiding sin ourselves; we are bound to use our utmost endeavors to prevent it in others, and not to shrink from the responsibility or odium of bearing public testimony against it. Especially does this apply to such sins as brought dishonor upon the holy name of God. A man may be patient in regard to wrongs done to himself, but not in regard to those that are done to the Most High.

(5.) 'Shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing.' Confession of sin, in order to be acceptable, must be particular. Such was David's confession; 'I have done this evil;' and such Achan's. It is not enough to rest in generals.

(7.) 'If he be not able to bring a lamb.' It is not the greatness of the gift but the heart of the giver, which God regards.

(16.) 'Shall make amends.' Repentance for wrong done to our neighbor is incomplete unless accompanied by restitution.

(18.) 'The priest shall make atonement for him.' The great Christian doctrine that to the atonement alone we owe all our pardon and peace, is here prominently set forth. Contrition, confession, restitution, all the feelings which accompany, and all the works which are meet for repentance, are indispensable; but it is faith in the atonement of Christ which justifies. Upon that alone must the penitent's hope be placed. While he weeps tears of grief and shame, while he renounces all his evil ways, while he strives to undo all the evil which he has previously done, the sacrifice of Christ must be looked to as the only meritorious cause, as the only appointed method of mercy. For this his earnest application must be made; without this his professed repentance will avail him nothing.

CHAPTER VI.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 If a soul sin, and [a] commit a trespass against the LORD, and [b] lie unto his neighbour in that [c] which was delivered him to keep, or in

[a] Numb. 5. 6.

[b] ch. 19. 11. Acts 5. 4. Col. 3. 9. [c] Exod. 22. 7. 10.

CHAPTER VI.

The Trespass-offering for sins of Injustice, Fraud, Robbery, False-Dealing, &c.

2. *If a soul sin and commit a trespass.* Gr. παριδων παριδῃ τας εντολας Κυριου, *despising shall despise the commandments of the Lord.* In the Heb. the phraseology is the same as in ch. 5. 15. It may here be remarked, that the first seven verses of this chapter are in the original embraced within the preceding chapter, to which, perhaps, they more properly belong.——¶ *Against the Lord.* Although all the instances specified relate to our neighbor, yet it is called *a trespass against the Lord*, because though the injury be done immediately to a fellow creature, yet an affront is thereby given to the Most High, whose authority has forbidden the wrong, and who has made the command of loving our neighbor second only to that of loving himself.——¶ *That which was delivered him to keep.* Heb. פִּקָּדוֹן *pikkadon.* 'From the present text we learn, incidentally, that when a person denied that he had received a deposit, and no proof of his having done so could be adduced, he was obliged to take an oath to that effect: but if he swore falsely, and afterwards repented of having done so, the sin-offering and restitution to the injured party afforded him an opportunity of atonement, without incurring the extent of punishment to which he would have been liable had the crime been judicially proved. The law is too distinctly announced in Exod. 22. to require enlarged remark; but as an important distinction concerning a deposited beast injured, or stolen from the person with whom it was deposited, is liable to escape notice, as stated in vv. 9–11 of that chapter, we may observe, that if the animal were stolen, or met with an accident, when out at pasture, the depositary was allowed to clear himself by oath, and then the owner had no claim upon him; but if it were stolen from his own premises, he was obliged to make restitution. This was obviously on the principle of its being more difficult to steal a beast from a house than any thing else; and that as he might have had the profit arising from the use of it, so he ought to bear the loss arising from his neglect in looking after it, or from accident—which is of more rare occurrence, and often difficult to distinguish from neglect (see Michaelis, vol. 2. p. 375). The importance of distinct regulations on the subject of deposited property, has been strongly felt by all Oriental legislators; and it proceeds from the fact that there were not at any time, and are not now, any of those responsible banking establishments which in modern Europe afford such important facilities for the application, transfer, and security of property. Hence, when a man is apprehensive of oppression or robbery, or from another cause, wishes to secure his property, he has no other alternative than either to hide it in some place of concealment, or to put it in the hands of some irresponsible person, in whom he thinks he has cause to rely. So also, if a man wishes to leave his place of residence for a time, he must either adopt one of these courses, or else, perhaps at a great sacrifice, turn his property into money or jewels, and take it with him, exposing it to all the dangers of the road; which, in the East, are very imminent and great. Much risk attends all these alternatives. For individuals to prove unfaithful to

fellowship, or in a thing taken away by violence, or hath [d] deceived his neighbour;

3 Or [e] have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and [f] sweareth falsely; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein:

4 Then it shall be, because he hath sinned and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he found,

[d] Prov. 24. 28, and 26. 19. [e] Deut. 22. 1, 2, 3. [f] Exod. 22. 11. ch. 19. 12. Jer. 7. 9. Zech. 5. 4.

their trust, as to property deposited with them, is so very common a circumstance, that a large proportion of the tales with which the Oriental story-tellers amuse or move their auditors, in coffee-houses and elsewhere, as well as of those which are written in books, turn upon the contrivances to which the owner of property is obliged to resort in order to recover it from the person to whom it has been intrusted. Men who would have remained honest under the ordinary circumstances of life are too often drawn aside from rectitude by the temptations of valuable property committed to their trust. Continual experience of this sort has had a very unhappy effect upon the moral feelings of Orientals. Men fear to confide in each other: and, in the case of property which persons desire to secure, they often prefer the hazards attending the other alternative of concealing it under ground, or in strange places, or even to build it up in the thick walls of their houses.'—*Pict. Bib.*——¶ *Or in fellowship.* Heb. בתשומת יד *bithsometh yad, in the putting of the hand.* The original phrase occurring only here, seems to denote such a *stipulation* as takes place in *copartnerships*, where the hand of one party is given to the other in pledge of upright and honorable dealing. The term is applicable however to any matter of dealing or traffic accompanied by a joining of hands. Gr. *περι κοινωνιας, concerning society or fellowship.* Chal. 'Fellowship of the hand.' Some would render it *a thing put or given into the hand, a deposit;* but this is expressed by the preceding word פקדון *pikkadon, that which is delivered to keep*, rendered in the Gr. *παραθηκη*, and occurring 2 Tim. 1. 12, 'I am persuaded that he is able to keep *that which I have committed unto him* (*παραθηκη*) against that day.' So again, 2 Tim. 1. 14, 'That good thing which was *committed unto thee* (*παραθηκη*), keep.' 1 Tim. 6. 20, 'O Timothy, keep that which is *committed to thy trust* (*παραθηκη*).'——¶ *Or in a thing taken by violence.* Le Clerc rightly observes, that this signifies a case of extortion by force, where there was no witness at hand who could give evidence before the judge for the person robbed. The laws, therefore, Ex. 22. 7, 15, appear to refer to cases where the thing could be proved; but here to those in which the person injured could bring no proof against the offender.——¶ *Or hath deceived his neighbor.* Heb. עשק *âsak, hath deceitfully or fraudulently oppressed.* That is, wronged him by false accusation, or any unjust means, especially by withholding what was due, or extorting what was not. Of this sin Zaccheus cleared himself by a fourfold restitution, Luke 19. 8. 'Who,' says Maimonides, 'is a deceitful oppressor? He that hath his neighbor's goods in his hand, with the owner's consent, and when they are demanded again, he keeps the goods in his own hands by force, and returns them not?'

4. *He shall restore, &c.* It appears from Num. 5. 6, 7, that *confession of the sin* was required in this and all similar instances of trespass. It is to be recollected that by a previous law, Ex. 22. 1, 7, 9, when a person was guilty of

5 Or all that about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even [g] restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, *and* give it unto him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass-offering.

6 And he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the LORD, [h] a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation for a trespass-offering, unto the priest:

[g] ch. 5. 16. Numb. 5. 7. 2 Sam. 12. 6. Luke 19. 8. [h] ch. 5. 15.

7 [i] And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the LORD: and it shall be forgiven him for any thing of all that he hath done in trespassing therein.

8 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

9 Command Aaron and his sons, saying, This *is* the law of the burnt-offering: it *is* the burnt-offering, because of the burning upon the altar all night unto the morning,

[i] ch. 4. 26.

any of the offences here specified, and withholding confession was convicted of the same by witnesses in a court of law, he was required to make a *four-fold restitution*, as we have shown in the Note on that passage. Here the mulct is lessened in consideration of a voluntary acknowledgment. He was to restore the principal with an additional *fifth part* as a compensation to the owner for the wrong sustained by him.

5. *In the day of his trespass-offering.* That is, in the day wherein he is found a trespasser, rendered by the Gr. *τῃ ἡμερᾳ ελεγχθῇ, in the day wherein he is convicted or reprehended;* or it may be understood as in our present version, the day wherein his trespass-offering was presented. The requisite restitution was not to be delayed.

The Law of the Burnt-offering.

9. *This is the law of the burnt-offering.* That is, this is the daily burnt-offering or perpetual sacrifice, consisting of two lambs offered upon the altar of burnt-offering, one in the morning and the other in the evening. That of the morning was offered about sunrise, after the incense was burnt upon the golden altar, and before any other sacrifice. That of the evening was offered in the decline of day, before the night began They were both wholly consumed on the altar, after the same manner as the free-will burnt-offering, but by a slow fire, that they might continue the longer burning. With each of the victims was offered a bread-offering and a drink-offering of strong wine (see Num. 28. 5–7.), the latter being poured out before the Lord, or about the altar, as a libation. The Jewish writers consider that the morning sacrifice made atonement for the sins of the preceding night, and that of the evening for the sins of the preceding day. It may be regarded as a daily expression of national as well as individual repentance, prayer, and thanksgiving.—Moses having hitherto given instructions directed more especially to the *people*, and pointing out their duties in respect to their sacred oblations, now enters upon those which had particular reference to the *priests*, who were charged with the oversight of all the sacrifices and services of their religion —¶ *Because of the burning;* or as it may be rendered, 'It is that which ascendeth by burning.' It seems to be designed to give a reason of the name, which is in Heb. עוֹלָה *olah*, *ascension*, from its all being burnt and *ascending* in smoke and flame. The words at the same time explain *what* burnt-offering he means, viz. *the daily sacrifice*, which was the principal of this kind of offerings, and regulated all the rest.——¶ *The fire of the altar shall be burning in (on) it.* Heb. תּוּקַד *tukad, shall be made to burn;* as the

and the fire of the altar shall be burning in it.

10 [k] And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh, and take up the ashes which the fire hath consumed with the burnt-offering on the altar, and he shall put them [l] beside the altar.

11 And [m] he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth the ashes without the camp [n] unto a clean place.

12 And the fire upon the altar shall be burning in it; it shall not be put out: and the priest shall burn wood on it every morning, and lay the burnt-offering in order upon it; and he shall burn thereon [o] the fat of the peace-offerings.

13 The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out.

[k] ch. 16. 4. Exod. 28. 39, 40, 41, 43. Ezek. 44. 17, 18. [l] ch. 1. 16. [m] Ezek. 44. 19.

[n] ch. 4. 12. [o] ch. 3. 3, 9, 14.

result of special care; shall be continually nourished.

10. *Shall put on his linen garment.* Heb. מִדּוֹ בַד *middo bad*, Gr. χιτωνα λινουν, *his linen coat.* The original word מִדּוֹ *middo* is a derivative from מָדַד *mâdad, to measure*, and implies a garment *commensurate* to the body, and therefore one of considerable size. 'It is the coat,' says Sol. Jarchi, 'and the scripture calleth it Middo, because it was like his measure (Middatho) that wore it.' The Heb. word for 'linen' (בַד *bad*) signifies a finer kind of linen than that made of the common flax, for which another term is employed, and therefore the Chal. here renders it by 'garments of Bysse,' of which see Note on Ex. 25. 4.——¶ *Shall put on other garments.* That is, either their common garments, or, as some of the Jewish commentators understand, other holy garments. The garments which the priests wore in the sanctuary they were not allowed to wear elsewhere, Ezek 44. 17, 19, 'And it shall come to pass that when they shall enter in at the gates of the inner court, they shall be clothed with linen garments. And when they go forth into the outer court, even into the outer court of the people, they shall put off their garments wherein they ministered, and lay them in the holy chambers, and they shall put on other garments; and they shall not sanctify the people with their garments.'

——¶ *Without the camp unto a clean place.* This indicated that some degree of holiness attached to the ashes as the relics of a sacrifice which had its accomplishment in the sufferings and death of Christ.

12. *The fire upon the altar shall be burning.* Heb. תּוּקַד *tukad, shall be kindled or made to burn.* Although the fire that consumed the sacrifices originally came down from heaven, yet it was to be kept perpetually burning by a supply of fuel. This fuel was to be exclusively of wood, a store of which was provided at the expense of the whole congregation; and as every thing pertaining to the service of God was to be of the best, so the wood according to the Hebrews, was to be of the choicest quality; that which was worm-eaten being instantly rejected, as also that which was obtained from the timber of old demolished buildings, none being admitted but that which was perfectly sound. In imitation of this perpetual fire, the ancient Persian Magi, and their descendants the *Parsees*, kept also a fire constantly burning; the latter continue it to the present day. Traces of the same custom are to be found among almost all heathen nations. Indeed it can scarcely be doubted that the Greek 'Estia' and the Roman 'Vesta,' *goddess of fire*, owed their origin to a Hebrew source, in which language אֵשׁ *esh*, Chal. *esha*, signifies *fire*.

14 ¶ [p]And this *is* the law of the meat-offering. The sons of Aaron shall offer it before the LORD, before the altar.

15 And he shall take of it his handful, of the flour of the meat-offering, and of the oil thereof, and all the frankincense which *is* upon the meat-offering, and shall burn *it* upon the altar *for* a sweet savour, *even* the [q]memorial of it, unto the LORD.

16 And [r]the remainder thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat; [s]with unleavened bread shall it be eaten in the holy place; in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation they shall eat it.

[p] ch. 2. 1. Numb. 15. 4. [q] ch. 2. 2, 9. [r] ch. 2. 3. Ezek. 44. 29. [s] ver. 26. ch. 10. 12, 13. Numb. 18. 10.

17 [t]It shall not be baken with leaven. [u]I have given it *unto them for* their portion of my offerings made by fire. [x]It *is* most holy, as *is* the sin-offering, and as the trespass-offering.

18 [y]All the males among the children of Aaron shall eat of it. [z]*It shall be* a statute for ever in your generations concerning the offerings of the LORD made by fire: [a]every one that toucheth them shall be holy.

19 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

20 [b]This *is* the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall

[t] ch. 2. 11. [u] Numb. 18. 9, 19. [x] ver. 25. ch. 2. 3. and 7. 1. Exod. 29. 37. [y] ver. 29. Numb. 18. 10. [z] ch. 3. 17. [a] ch. 22. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Exod. 29. 37. [b] Exod. 29. 2.

The Law of the Meat-offering.

14. *This is the law of the meat-offering.* Heb. מנחה *min'hah*, of which see Note on Lev. 2. 1–3. This precept respects not the meat-offering which was to accompany the daily burnt-offering, but that which was offered alone as a free-will-offering, and in place of a voluntary burnt-offering of greater value, as described Lev. 2. 1–3. The sum of the directions here given is, that no leaven should ever be mixed with such bread or cakes; that after a small part of it had been burnt upon the altar as God's portion, the priests in waiting were to have the remainder, and that this was to be eaten in the court of the tabernacle and nowhere else—in all which particulars the precept corresponds to that given relative to the parts of the sin and trespass-offerings that accrued to the priests.——¶ *The sons of Aaron shall offer it.* That is, in rotation, one at a time. The phrase 'sons of Aaron' may here be taken in its literal sense, but in after-time this expression meant the *successors of Aaron* in the holy office, Comp. v. 20.

16. *With unleavened bread shall it be eaten.* The insertion of the word 'with' in this place, which does not occur in the original, obscures the true sense. The meaning is, not that the remainder of the meat-offering was to be eaten by the priests *with the addition of unleavened cakes*, but that the meal itself was to be *made into unleavened cakes*, and thus eaten.——¶ *In the holy place.* This phrase denotes in this connexion, contrary to its ordinary import, the court of the tabernacle where all the holy things were boiled, baked, dressed and eaten by the Levitical order, who ministered at the altar.

18. *Every one that toucheth them.* Or Heb. כל אשר יגע *kol asher yigga*, *all that toucheth*; implying things as well as persons. The meaning is, that no unclean person or common vessel of ministry might touch them. Gr. *πας ὸς εαν ἁψηται αυτων ἁγιασθησεται, whosoever toucheth them shall be sanctified.* 'The meaning is,' says Chazkuni, 'that he shall purify himself before he touch them; and that any vessel or implement to be used about them shall first be sanctified.' Junius, how-

offer unto the LORD in the day when he is anointed; the tenth part of an [c] ephah of fine flour for a meat-offering perpetual, half of it in the morning, and half thereof at night.

21 In a pan it shall be made with oil; *and when it is* baken, thou shalt bring it in; *and* the baken pieces of the meat-offering shalt thou offer *for* a sweet savour unto the LORD.

22 And the priest of his sons [d] that is anointed in his stead shall offer it: *It is* a statute for ever unto the LORD; [e] it shall be wholly burnt.

23 For every meat-offering for the priest shall be wholly burnt: it shall not be eaten.

24 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

25 Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, saying, [f] This *is* the law of the sin-offering: [g] In the place

[c] Exod. 16. 36.

[d] ch. 4. 3. [e] Exod. 29. 25. [f] ch. 4. 2, [g] ch. 1. 3, 5, 11, and 4. 24, 29, 33.

ever, contends that the 'touching' refers wholly to persons, and not to things, because it comes in as a reason for the eating of them being confined to Aaron's sons; while Hesychius ascribes the sanctification to the touch. Comp. v. 27.

The Offering at the Consecration of a Priest.

20. *In the day when he is anointed.* From the obvious import of the precept, we should naturally understand that this offering, called by the Jews 'the meal-offering of initiation or consecration,' was to be presented only on the day in which any one of the high priests' line was inducted into office; but it is maintained by several of the Hebrew commentators that the high priest was bound to offer it daily, beginning from the day in which he was anointed, and continuing it through the whole period of his office; so that, according to them, 'in the day' is equivalent to '*from* the day.' Josephus also says, 'The high priest sacrificed twice every day at his own charges, and that this was his sacrifice.' It is, however, doubtful whether such a construction can fairly be put upon the passage. It may be called 'a meal-offering perpetual,' from its being always *statedly* offered at the High Priests' initiation into office. From this we may understand what is intended by its being said that this is 'the offering of Aaron and his sons, and that *they* should offer it,' &c. It is not that he and they should offer it *together*, but Aaron now, and his sons successively in after times, as they were inducted in turn into the priestly dignity.

23. *It shall not be eaten.* In this respect it differed from the other meal-offering. The Priest's offering must be all burnt, because, although he figuratively bore the sins of the people, yet there was no one to bear his sins, nor could he bear them himself. There was, moreover, a general rule (v. 30), against the eating of any sacrifice, the blood of which was brought *within the tabernacle;* and such were the offerings of the Priest and the Congregation. See Note on v. 30.

The Law of the Sin-offering.

25. *This is the law of the sin-offering.* The directions here given are mainly a repetition of those contained Lev. 4. 24–31, but with these additional circumstances, viz. that none but consecrated persons or things should touch any part of it after it was once devoted to God, but especially the blood that was spilled for the atonement of the offerer. And with a view to preserve the strictest regard to holy things, if any of its blood at the time of the slaughter should chance to dash upon the robes even of the priest in waiting, it was to be wash-

where the burnt-offering is killed shall the sin-offering be killed before the LORD: [h] it *is* most holy.

26 [i] The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it: [k] in the holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation.

27 [l] Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy: and when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof upon any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place.

28 But the earthen vessel wherein it is sodden [m] shall be broken: and if it be sodden in a brazen pot, it shall be both scoured, and rinsed in water.

[h] ver. 17. ch. 21. 22. [i] ch. 10. 17, 18. Numb. 18. 9, 10. Ezek. 44. 28, 29. [k] ver. 16. [l] Exod. 29. 37, and 30. 29.

[m] ch. 11. 33, and 15. 12.

---

ed out; but particularly if it fell upon the clothes of the offerer, it was to be most carefully cleansed. If it were sprinkled upon any earthen vessel into which it would sink deep, and not be easily rubbed out, such vessel was to be broken and laid by; and if upon a vessel of brass, which from its hardness would be less apt to imbibe the liquid, it was to be well scoured and rinsed. All this went to shadow forth the contagion of sin, and the constant care requisite to cleanse ourselves by repentance and faith from its polluting stains. Of this truth the ancient Hebrew doctors seem to have had a clear perception, as R. Menahem says, in speaking of this washing of garments, that the reason of it was, 'that it was necessary to do away uncleanness by the waters that are on high.'——¶ *In the place where the burnt-offering is killed shall the sin-offering be killed.* That was on the north side of the altar, Lev. 1. 11. 'Thereby was figured,' says Ainsworth, 'that Christ, our Sin-offering, should be crucified on Mount Cavalry, which was on the north-west side of Jerusalem; as by the Jews' tradition the morning sacrifice was killed at the north-west horn of the altar.'

26. *The priest that offereth it for sin.* Heb. הכהן המחטא אתו *hakkohën ham'hattë otho, the priest that expiateth-sin-by-it.* Chal. 'That maketh atonement by the blood thereof.' Gr. *αναφερων, that offereth.* The phraseology is remarkable from the fact that the original word comes from the same root as חטאה *'hatâăh, sin* or *sin-offering.* In the Piel form, which here occurs, it is defined by Gesenius, *to offer as a sin-offering, to make atonement, to expiate, to cleanse persons or things by a sacred rite.*

27. *Whatsoever shall touch the blood thereof, &c.* That is, the blood of the sin-offering, whether it were that which was to be eaten, or that which was to be burnt—a rite peculiar to the sin-offering above all the other most holy things. As this sacrifice has especial respect to Christ, who was made sin for us, so this direction may perhaps point to the reverential and holy use that is to be made of the mystery of our redemption, of which those that are made partakers ought to be washed, cleansed, and sanctified; to possess the vessels of their bodies in holiness and honor; and not to yield their members as instruments of unrighteousness unto iniquity.

28. *The earthen vessel wherein it was sodden shall be broken.* 'This is a very remarkable instruction. We all know that earthen vessels are broken, and others thoroughly scoured, when supposed to be defiled, among the Mohammedans and Hindoos, as they were also among the Jews. But the present instance is of a different character. The earthen vessel was to be broken, and the copper one scoured and rinsed, not because they were defiled, but because the flesh of the sin-offering having been

29 [n] All the males among the priests shall eat thereof: [o] it *is* most holy.

30 [p] And no sin-offering, whereof *any* of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile *withal* in the holy *place*, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire.

[n] ver. 18. Numb. 18. 10. [o] ver. 25. [p] ch. 4. 7, 11, 12, 18, 21, and 10. 18. and 16. 27. Heb. 13. 11.

cooked in them, they had thus become too sacred for common use. We shall elsewhere have occasion to remark on instances in which earthen utensils were broken, and others scoured in consequence of defilement. At present we only direct attention to the fact, that at this time the culinary vessels of the Hebrews seem to have been *exclusively* of earthenware or copper. Iron, though known to them, was at this time very little in use for any purpose, and even when they became better acquainted with that valuable metal it is doubtful if their culinary or other vessels were ever made of it. At least, no pot, pan, or other vessel is said in all the Scripture to be of iron. What is translated 'iron pan,' in Ezek. 4. 3, is properly an 'iron plate,' as the context alone sufficiently indicates. In point of fact, the culinary and other domestic vessels throughout the East remain to this day, as we find them thus early in the Mosaic history, either of copper, earthenware, or wood (ch. 11. 38; 14. 12), although no doubt the quality and manufacture have much improved. The writer, in the course of journeys and residence in different parts of Western Asia, does not think that he ever met with an instance of a cooking vessel of any other metal than copper: and dishes and bowls of the same metal tinned are those which most usually make their appearance on the tables of kings and great men. When luxury desires something more rich and costly for the table than copper, it finds indulgence, not in silver and gold, but in china and fine earthenware.'—*Pict. Bib.*

30. *And no sin-offering whereof, &c.* We see from Lev. 4. 5, 16, that the blood of the sin-offerings for the high priest and the congregation *was* brought into the tabernacle, and consequently they were not to be eaten, but to be burnt, as we learn was the fact, Lev. 4. 12, 21. As it appears from Lev. 10. 17. that the eating of the offerings of the people was in a sense typical of the bearing and expiating their sins, this precept tended to show the intrinsic inability of the Levitical priesthood to procure a complete reconciliation of men to God. This will be more evident from viewing the passage in its evangelical connexions. The apostle, Heb 13. 10–13, says, 'We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach.' Now it is to be recollected, that under the law the blood of such sacrifices as were eaten by the priests came not into the sanctuary; which argued the unworthiness and incompetency of those sacrifices to answer the end of a perfect atonement. But Christ, with his blood shed for our sins, entered into the holy place, not that which was made with hands, but into heaven itself, and thereby obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. 9. 11, 12, 24. This great sacrifice therefore does away the availableness of the Levitical offerings. As the priests of the law were forbidden to eat of the propitiatory sacrifices whose blood was carried within the vail, but

were commanded to burn them entirely without the camp, what right can they have, while they adhere to the legal institution, to partake of Christ's sacrifice? If they continue to adhere to the legal services of the tabernacle, they virtually renounce the benefit of the sacrifice of Christ. Indeed, the apostle would intimate, that the Levitical priesthood is necessarily abolished, for there is now nothing on which the priests can live, if not upon that altar on which they are to feed by faith. This he proves thus: The bodies of those beasts whose blood was brought into the sanctuary by the high priest, were burnt without the camp. Consequently there was nothing left of them for their sustenance. But these sacrifices were a most significant type of the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, who has become the substance of the legal shadows. What then shall the priests eat? Upon what shall they live, if not by faith upon the great propitiation? What other altar but the Christian altar remains? And what right can they have to this, if they adhere to the Jewish?

Remarks.—(2.) No sentiment should be more deeply engraven upon our hearts than that a sin against our neighbor is a trespass against God. So David says, 'Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight,' though his offence was primarily committed against Uriah.

(3.) 'Or have found that which was lost.' The judgment of every honest mind is, that he who finds any lost property, and makes not all due inquiry to ascertain the owner, should in equity be treated as a thief.

(5, 6.) 'Shall bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord, a ram without blemish.' By this precept we are again taught that disobedience to God is the great evil even of those crimes which are injurious to man, and that repentance, and even restitution, though needful, in order to forgiveness, cannot atone for sin.

(12.) As the priest was to renew the fire upon the altar every morning, and to guard with the utmost care against its going out, so our first work with the return of the morning light, should be that the fire of holy love be kindled afresh in our hearts, and through the day our study should be to keep it constantly burning.

(22.) 'And the priest shall offer it.' The benefits of Christ's atonement, in order to be available, must be *personally* apprehended. However intrinsically sufficient for the salvation of all men, none will be the better for it who do not for themselves make use of it. The offending priest, or ruler, or common person, must *himself* bring his sin-offering, must lay *his own* hands upon its head, must thus show how nearly he felt *himself* to be concerned in the ceremony; and every sinner now must individually bring this sacrifice of Christ, in faith, as the atonement for his own sin. He must not rest in the mere generality that 'we are all sinners,' and 'Christ died for all.' He must feel and apply all this to himself. He must in effect say, 'Lord, I am indeed a sinner; a great and grievous sinner against thee; but here is my sin-offering; here is the sacrifice of thine own blessed Son; here is the atonement of thine appointment; this I bring to thee with my soul's approval, and my heart's desire that it may be accepted by thee, and put away all my sin.'

CHAPTER VII.

Additional Rules and Distinctions relative to the Trespass-offerings.

1. *This is the law of the trespass-offering.* In the Heb. simply תורת האשם *torath hââsham, the law of the trespass* Gr. ὁ νομος του κριου του περι πλημμελειας, *the law of the ram for trespass.* It is a law for the direction of the priests in the discharge of their office relative to

CHAPTER VII.

LIKEWISE [a] this *is* the law of the trespass-offering: [b] it *is* most holy.

2 [c] In the place where they kill the burnt-offering shall they kill the trespass-offering: and the blood thereof shall he sprinkle round about upon the altar.

3 And he shall offer of it [d] all the fat thereof; the rump, and the fat that covereth the inwards,

4 And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* on them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul *that is* above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away:

5 And the priest shall burn them upon the altar *for* an offering made by fire unto the LORD: it *is* a trespass-offering.

6 [e] Every male among the priests shall eat thereof: it shall be eaten in the holy place: [f] it *is* most holy.

7 As the sin-offering *is*, so *is* [g] the trespass-offering: *there is* one law for them: the priest that maketh atonement therewith shall have *it*.

8 And the priest that offereth any man's burnt-offering, *even* the priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering which he hath offered.

[a] ch. 5. and 6. 1—7. [b] ch. 6. 17, 25, and 21. 22. [c] ch. 1. 3, 5, 11, and 4. 24, 29, 33. [d] ch. 3. 4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, and 4. 8. 9. Exod. 29. 13.

[e] ch. 6. 16, 17, 18. Numb. 18. 9. 10. [f] ch. 2. 3. [g] ch. 6. 25, 26, and 14. 13.

---

the Trespass-offering.——¶ *It is most holy.* Heb. קדש קדשים הוא *kodesh kodoshim hoo, it is holiness of holinesses.* The design is to convey a general significant intimation in regard to the nature of these offerings. They, as well as the Sin-offerings, were to be ranked in their estimation among the 'most holy things,' and practically treated accordingly. Comp. v. 6.

2. *The blood thereof shall he sprinkle round about upon the altar.* The rites in regard to the Sin and the Trespass-offering were for the most part the same, but there was this difference as to the disposal of the blood, viz. that the blood of the Trespass-offering here mentioned was to be sprinkled *round* the altar, whereas that of the Sin-offering was to be put *upon the horns* of the altar. Ch. 4. 25, 34. This moreover was to be a *male*, the other might be a *female* sacrifice. This was always for a single person, but a Sin-offering might be for the whole congregation. Lev. 4. 13.

4. *The fat that is on them.* That is, chiefly the fat that was found in a *detached state*, not mixed with the muscles.

6. *Every male among the priests shall eat thereof.* All the fat being offered to God, the flesh became the portion of the priest, who, with his *male* children, was to eat it, but only within the precincts of the sanctuary.

7. *There is one law for them.* The import is, that what has been omitted in the explanation of the Sin-offering must be learned from that of the Trespass-offering, and *vice versa.*——¶ *Shall have it.* That is, by synecdoche, that part of it which was by the divine constitution allowed to the priest.

8. *The priest shall have to himself the skin.* All the flesh of the burnt-offerings being consumed as well as the fat, there could nothing fall to the share of the priest but the skin; which must have been very valuable, as they were used as mattresses, and probably as carpets to sit upon in the day, as they are still used by some of the inhabitants and the dervishes of the East. See Harmer's observations, vol. 1. p. 236. Bp. Patrick remarks upon this passage, that 'It is probable that Adam himself offered the first sacrifice, and had the skin given him by God, to make garments for him and his wife; in conformity to which the priests ever after had

9 And [h] all the meat-offering that is baken in the oven, and all that is dressed in the frying-pan, and in the pan, shall be the priest's that offereth it.

10 And every meat-offering mingled with oil, and dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have, one *as much* as another.

11 And [i] this *is* the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which he shall offer unto the LORD.

12 If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers [k] anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour, dried.

13 Besides the cakes, he shall offer *for* his offering, [l] leavened

[h] ch. 2. 3. 10. Numb. 18. 9. Ezek. 44. 29.
[i] ch. 3. 1, and 22. 18. 21.
[k] ch. 2. 4. Numb. 6. 15. [l] Amos 4. 5.

---

the skin of the whole burnt-offering for their portion: which was a custom among the Gentiles as well as the Jews, who gave the skins of their sacrifices to the priests when they were not burnt with the sacrifices.'

9, 10. *And all the meat-offerings.* That is, all the baked or fried meat-offerings, with the exception of that part called the 'memorial,' ch. 2. 4–10, and which was to be burnt upon the altar, was to go to the particular priest that offered it; but in the case of the *raw* flour-offerings of that kind, the remainder was to be equally shared by all the priests in attendance.

Additional Rules respecting the Peace-offerings.

11. *And this is the law, &c.* Directions had previously been given, ch. 3. to the *people*, regulating this kind of offerings when presented by them; but in this connexion more specific orders are given to the *priests* on the same subject. The reason of this was, that as there were *several sorts* of peace-offerings, so there were various rites to be observed in regard to them—rites which are here called 'the law of the peace-offerings.' In the order in which the different offerings are spoken of in ch. 3. the peace-offering occurs the third; but in that chapter the law of peace-offerings is no further stated than as it accords with the burnt-offering, and the fuller statement is reserved for the passage before us. Hence, in the enumeration of the different offerings in v. 37, the peace-offering is fitly-mentioned last.——¶ *Which he shall offer.* The word 'he' here has no express antecedent. It should be rendered according to the frequent idiom of the Hebrew, 'which one shall offer,' or 'which shall be offered.' See Note on Lev. 1. 5.

1. *The Eucharistic Peace-offering.*

12, 13. *If he offer it for a thanksgiving.* Heb. עַל תּוֹדָה *al todah, for a confession.* Gr. περι αινεσεως, *for praise.* That is, in token of gratitude for special mercies and favors received, such as recovery from sickness, preservation in a journey, deliverance at sea, redemption from captivity, all of which are specified in Psalm 107, and for them men are called upon to offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving. In allusion to this kind of offering the apostle says, Heb. 13. 15, 'By him, therefore, let us offer the *sacrifice of praise* to God continually.' In regard to oblations of this kind, the precept is, that along with the bullock, goat, or sheep, the offerer should present pancakes mixed with pure oil, but unleavened, inasmuch as part of them was to be offered up to God with the fat upon the altar, where leaven was entirely prohibited. Still leaven was not excluded from another part of the offering, viz. that of the bread of the priests, which was not burnt upon the altar. The occasion of the offering, it is to be recollected, was

bread, with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace-offerings.

14 And of it he shall offer one out of the whole oblation *for* an heave-offering unto the LORD, [m] *and* it shall be the priest's that sprinkleth the blood of the peace-offerings.

[m] Numb. 18. 8, 11, 19.

15 [n] And the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings for thanksgiving shall be eaten the same day that it is offered; he shall not leave any of it until the morning.

16 But [o] if the sacrifice of his offering *be* a vow, or a voluntary

[n] ch. 22. 30. [o] ch. 19. 6, 7, 8.

one of gratitude, praise, and rejoicing; and on such an occasion God would kindly allow a more palatable species of food for his servants, and accept at his own table the same bread which they were wont to use at theirs.

14. *Of it he shall offer one.* Heb. ממנו *mimmenu*, *of it*; i. e. of the bread, one of the leavened cakes or loaves before-mentioned, which was to be presented to God as a heave-offering. When this was done, all that remained was the portion of the priest who sprinkled the blood of the peace-offerings on the altar.——¶ *For an heave-offering.* Heb. תרומה *terumah*, from the root רום *rūm*, *to lift up*; so called from its being *heaved* or *lifted up on high*, in token that it was thereby directed to the God of heaven, and devoutly proffered to his acceptance. Gr. and Chal. 'A separation, or separated thing.' For a full account of this kind of offering see Note on Ex. 29. 24, 28.

15. *Shall be eaten the same day that it is offered.* The reason of this injunction, which was observed in most of the sacred feasts, especially the passover, may be learned from the following appropriate extract from Philo:—'It was not fit that those holy things should be put into their cupboards, but immediately set before those who were in need; for they were no longer his who offered them, but his to whom they were offered; who being himself most liberal and bountiful, would have guests invited to his table to partake with those who offered the sacrifice. And these he would not have to look upon themselves as masters of the feast, for they are but ministers of the feast, not masters or entertainers; that belongs to God himself, whose bounty ought not to be concealed by preferring sordid parsimony before generous humanity.' His meaning obviously is, that all the sacrifice was God's, who graciously granted to him who offered it a part of it with which to entertain his friends and the poor, whom he would have to be invited forthwith, that no part of it might be perverted to any other than the designed use. Add to this, that in a country like Palestine, it was apt to putrify; and as it was considered to be holy, it would be very improper to expose that to putrefaction which had been consecrated to the Divine Being.

2. The Votive, or Voluntary Peace-offering.

16. *If the sacrifice of his offering be a vow.* This was the second kind of peace-offerings contemplated in this part of the law. They were such as were either simply and unconditionally devoted without special respect to any past or future favor; or such as were vowed upon a condition, as when Jacob pledged himself, Gen. 28. 20–22, saying, 'If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace: then shall the Lord be my God, and this stone which I have set for a pillar shall be God's house; and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee.' The principal point in which they differed

offering, it shall be eaten the same day that he offereth his sacrifice: and on the morrow also the remainder of it shall be eaten:

17 But the remainder of the flesh of the sacrifice on the third day shall be burnt with fire.

18 And if *any* of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings be eaten at all on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be [p] imputed unto him that offereth it: it shall be an [q] abomina-

[p] Numb. 18. 27. [q] ch. 11. 10, 11, 41, and 19. 7.

from the preceding consisted in this, that the offerer and his friends were required immediately to begin to feast upon the sacrifice, that they might, if possible, eat the whole of it on that day; but if this were not easily practicable, then they might defer the remainder till the second day. But the indulgence was never to be extended beyond that time. Should any of it remain till the third day it was to be burnt; and should the offerer presume to eat the least part of it then, it would not only disannul the effect of his sacrifice, but render him unclean and guilty to a high degree. Something analogous to this obtained in the heathen worship. Bochart shows from Macrobius, that the Romans had a sacrifice called 'Protervia,' in which it was the custom, if any thing of the feast remained, to have it consumed in the fire. (*Hierozoic Sac., p.* 1, *c.* 50.)—'As the people of the East generally eat their meat the same day on which it is killed, and almost never later than the second day, we are inclined to concur in the view of Harmer ('Observations,' vol. i. p. 457) who thinks that this regulation was intended to preclude any attempt to preserve the meat, by potting or otherwise, so that it might be taken to different parts of the country, and used superstitiously, perhaps, as peculiarly holy food, or applied in some way inconsistent with the intention of the law. That intention was, that what became the offerer's share of the sacrifice he had presented, he should eat cheerfully before the Lord with his friends, and that the poor and destitute should partake in the benefit. This object was ensured by the regulation which precluded the meat from being kept beyond the second day.'—*Pict. Bib.* ——¶ *A voluntary offering*, or Heb. נדבה *nedabah*, *a free-will offering*; i. e. an offering not required by any law, but which a person might be prompted spontaneously to present as the expression of a grateful heart.

18. *Neither shall it be imputed to him that offereth it.* Heb. יחשב *yĕhâshĕb*, Gr. ου λογισθησεται αυτῳ, *it shall not be placed to his account.* He shall not be accounted as having made any offering at all. The sense of the term may be more fully learned by its use in a passage of opposite import, Num. 18. 27, 30, 'And this your heave-offering shall be *reckoned* (נחשב *nehshab*) unto you, as though it were the corn of the threshing-floor, and as the fulness of the wine-press. Therefore thou shalt say unto them, When ye have heaved the best thereof from it, then it shall be *counted* (נחשב *nehshab*) unto the Levites as the increase of the threshing-floor, and as the increase of the wine-press.'—— ¶ *It shall be an abomination.* Heb. פגול *piggul*, *a polluted, foul, fetid thing.* The word is peculiar, and of rare occurrence. It is met with only here and Lev. 19. 7, Is. 65. 4, and Ezek 4. 14; in all which cases the leading idea is plainly that of something exceedingly loathsome and offensive, particularly to the smell. Probably our English word *carrion* comes the nearest to a true definition. The Gr. here has μιασμα *miasma*, though it elsewhere renders it by *unsacrificeable* and *profane.* In the version of Aquila, one of the exactest of translators, the original in Lev. 19. 7, is rendered αποβλητον, *that*

tion, and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity.

19 And the flesh that toucheth any unclean *thing* shall not be eaten; it shall be burnt with fire: and as for the flesh, all that be clean shall eat thereof.

20 But the soul that eateth *of* the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings that *pertain* unto the LORD, [r] having his uncleanness upon him, even that soul [s] shall be cut off from his people.

21 Moreover, the soul that shall touch any unclean *thing*, *as* [t] the uncleanness of man, or *any* [u] unclean beast, or any [w] abominable unclean *thing*, and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings which *pertain* unto the LORD, even that soul [x] shall be cut off from his people.

22 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

[r] ch. 15. 3. [s] Gen. 17. 14. [t] ch. 12. and 13. and 15. [u] ch. 11. 24, 28. [w] Ezek. 4. 14. [x] ver. 20.

23 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, [y] Ye shall eat no manner of fat, of ox, or of sheep, or of goat.

24 And the fat of the [z] beast that dieth of itself, and the fat of that which is torn with beasts, may be used in any other use: but ye shall in no wise eat of it.

25 For whosoever eateth the fat of the beast, of which men offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, even the soul that eateth *it* shall be cut off from his people.

26 [a] Moreover, ye shall eat no manner of blood, *whether it be* of fowl or of beast, in any of your dwellings.

27 Whatsoever soul *it be* that eateth any manner of blood, even that soul shall be cut off from his people.

28 ¶ And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying,

[y] ch. 3. 17. [z] ch. 17. 15. Deut. 14. 21. Ezek. 4. 14, and 44. 31. [a] Gen. 9. 4. ch. 3. 17, and 17. 10—14.

---

which is to be rejected, and accordantly with this the apostle, 1 Tim. 4. 14, speaking of certain meats which were not to be rejected, makes use of precisely the same term.——¶ *Shall bear his iniquity.* That is, the punishment of his iniquity. This law is repeated, and the sanction enforced, with fearful emphasis, in Lev. 19. 5–8: 'And if ye offer a sacrifice of peace-offerings unto the Lord, ye shall offer it at your own will. It shall be eaten the same day ye offer it, and on the morrow: and if aught remain until the third day, it shall be burnt in the fire. And if it be eaten at all on the third day, it is abominable; it shall not be accepted. Therefore every one that eateth it shall bear his iniquity, because he hath profaned the hallowed thing of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people.'

19. *And the flesh that toucheth.* Chal. 'The holy flesh;' so called from its being consecrated to holy purposes. This polluting contact might happen while the flesh of the peace-offerings was being carried from the altar to the place where it was eaten.——¶ *As for the flesh.* That is, all the flesh that was not defiled by touching any unclean thing.

20. *Even that soul shall be cut off from his people.* See this phrase explained in the Note on Gen. 17. 14. Chal. 'That man shall be destroyed.' Gr. απολειται, *shall perish.*

Prohibition of Fat and Blood.

23–27. *No manner of fat, of ox, or of sheep, &c.* This explains and limits the precept contained Lev. 3. 17, restricting it to the fat of the three kinds of animals offered in sacrifice. We may perhaps recognize some physical as well as moral reasons for this pro-

29 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, [b] He that offereth the sacrifice of his peace-offerings unto the LORD, shall bring his oblation unto the LORD of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings.

30 [c] His own hands shall bring the offerings of the LORD made by fire; the fat with the breast, it shall he bring, that [d] the breast may be waved *for* a wave-offering before the LORD.

31 [e] And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar: [f] but the breast shall be Aaron's and his sons'.

[b] ch. 3. 1. [c] ch. 3. 3, 4, 9, 14. [d] Exod. 29. 24, 27. ch. 8. 27, and 9. 21. Numb. 6. 20. [e] ch. 3. 5, 11, 16. [f] ver. 34.

32 And [g] the right shoulder shall ye give unto the priest *for* a heave-offering of the sacrifices of your peace-offerings.

33 He among the sons of Aaron that offereth the blood of the peace-offerings, and the fat, shall have the right shoulder for *his* part.

34 For [h] the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder have I taken of the children of Israel from off the sacrifices of their peace-offerings, and have given them unto Aaron the priest, and unto his sons, by a statute for ever, from among the children of Israel.

[g] ver. 34. ch. 9. 21. Numb. 6. 20. [h] Exod. 29. 28. ch. 10. 14, 15. Numb. 18. 18. 19. Deut. 18. 3.

---

hibition. 'Medically considered, fat is certainly unwholesome, and particularly so in warm climates. Besides this, the eating of the fat pieces in question, and the use of fat in the preparation of food, is highly injurious to persons particularly subject to cutaneous disorders, as the Israelites seem to have been. To this we may add, that, as it was an object of many laws to discourage any friendly intercourse between the Israelites and the idolatrous nations, nothing could be better calculated than the present and other dietetic regulations, to prevent them from joining in the festivities and social entertainments of their neighbors.'—*Pict. Bib.* The prohibition of blood is more general, because the fat was offered to God only by way of acknowledgment; but the blood *made atonement for the soul*, and so typified the sacrifice of Christ much more clearly than the burning of fat; to this, therefore, a greater reverence must be paid, till those types had their accomplishment in the offering up of the body of Christ once for all. The Jews rightly expound this law as forbidding only the *blood of the life*, as they express it, not that which we call the *gravy*, for of that they supposed it was lawful to eat.

Rules regulating the Priests' portion in the Peace-offerings.

29. *He that offereth, &c.* The drift of this verse is not very obvious. Patrick suggests that it is designed to convey the intimation that before the offerer and his friends feasted together, v. 15–18, he was to take care out of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings, 'to bring his oblation unto the Lord;' i. e. to see that God had first his part of the peace-offering, for until that was done, no one could lawfully have any thing to do with the remainder. This interpretation we have, on the whole, little hesitation in adopting.

30. *His own hands shall bring, &c.* That is, it was an act which the offerer himself was to perform; and yet we learn elsewhere that this was not to be independently of the agency of the priest. For the sacrifice being slain and duly divided, the priest was to put what belonged to the Lord, viz. the fat with the breast and the shoulder, into the offerer's own hands, that he might present it himself to the Divine Majesty. This was to be done with a *waving* motion upward, in token of his devoutly proffering and delivering it over to God as Lord of heaven and earth.

35 ¶ This *is the portion of* the anointing of Aaron, and of the anointing of his sons, out of the offerings of the LORD made by fire, in the day *when* he presented them to minister unto the LORD in the priest's office;

36 Which the LORD commanded to be given them of the children of Israel, [i] in the day that he anointed them, *by* a statute for ever throughout their generations.

37 This *is* the law [k] of the burnt-offering, [l] of the meat-offering, [m] and of the sin-offering, [n] and of the trespass-offering, [o] and of the consecrations, and [p] of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings;

38 Which the LORD commanded Moses in mount Sinai, in the day that he commanded the children of Israel [q] to offer their oblations unto the LORD, in the wilderness of Sinai.

ch 8. 12, 30 Exod 40. 13, 15. [k] ch. 6 9.

[l] ch. 6. 14. [m] ch. 6. 25. [n] ver. 1. [o] ch. 6 20. Exod. 29. 1. [p] ver. 11. [q] ch. 1. 2.

The act implied also an acknowledgment that every good thing came down from God, and an intimation that all the ways of his people should *tend upward*, so that their conversation should be in heaven.

35. *This* is the portion of *the anointing, &c.* Heb. זאת משחת *zoth mishhath, this is the anointing* of Auron, &c. That is, this wave-breast and heave-shoulder are the portion or privilege arising from their being anointed and consecrated to the priesthood. That the allusion is to the 'portion,' is evident from the preceding and succeeding context; and in v. 36, it is said, 'which the Lord commanded to be given them,' &c. As for 'anointing' being used for 'anointed ones,' it is a phraseology similar to that by which 'dreams' is put for 'dreamers,' Jer. 27. 9, 'spirits' for 'spiritual gifts,' 1 Cor. 14. 12, 'thanksgivings' for 'companies of thanksgivers,' Num. 12. 31, 'circumcision' for 'persons circumcised,' Rom. 2. 26, 'divination' for the 'rewards of divination,' Num. 22. 7, 'iniquity' for the 'punishment or desert of iniquity,' Lev. 7. 18, Job 11. 6, and so in numerous other instances.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Consecration of Aaron and his sons to the Priesthood.

The sacred writer here passes from sacred *things* to sacred *persons*. The present chapter describes the ceremonies previously ordained which marked the induction of Aaron and his sons into the priestly office. Most of the rites, however, peculiar to this occasion, are the same with those commanded Ex. 29. and which are there explained at length. Consequently but brief comments will be requisite in this connexion. It may suffice simply to remark, that the priesthood was originally appointed to remain in Aaron's family through all succeeding generations, and no one who was not of that lineage might on any account intrude into the sacred office. Aaron was succeeded by Eleazar, his eldest surviving son, after the death of Nadab and Abihu, and it continued in his family through seven generations, till the time of Eli. On his death it was removed from that branch for the wickedness of Eli's sons, and given to the descendants of Ithamar, Aaron's other son. In the time of Solomon it returned again into the line of Eleazar, in which it continued till the Babylonish captivity. Jeshua, the first high priest after the return of the Jews, was of the same family; but after his time the appointment became very uncertain and irregular; and after Judea became a Roman province, no regard whatever was paid to this part of the original divine institution. The office was in fact in process of time so far desecrated in the general corruption, that it was

CHAPTER VIII.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 [a] Take Aaron and his sons with him, and [b] the garments, and [c] the anointing oil, and a bullock for the sin-offering, and two rams, and a basket of unleavened bread;

3 And gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

[a] Exod. 29. 1, 2, 3. [b] Exod. 28. 2, 4. [c] Exod. 30. 24, 25.

4 And Moses did as the LORD commanded him; and the assembly was gathered together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

5 And Moses said unto the congregation, [d] This *is* the thing which the LORD commanded to be done.

6 And Moses brought Aaron and his sons, [e] and washed them with water.

[d] Exod. 29. 4. [e] Exod. 29. 4.

---

often sold to the highest bidder, whether of the family or not; and so things continued, till finally the nation had filled up the measure of its iniquities, and priest, altar, and temple were all swept away in the abolition of the Jewish economy and the dispersion of the race.

2. *Take Aaron and his sons with him, and the garments.* That is, the holy priestly garments which God had before commanded to be made, and which were now ready.

3. *Gather thou all the congregation.* That is, the elders and principal men of the congregation, who represented the body of the people, as the court would hold but few of the many thousands of Israel. This is confirmed by Lev. 9. 1, where Moses is said to have called the *elders* together instead of the *whole congregation*, as here.

4. *The assembly was gathered together.* Heb. עֵדָה *ëdah;* the same word with that rendered 'congregation' in v. 2, and which ought here also, for uniformity's sake, to have been rendered in the same way. The nature and objects of the Levitical priesthood were such as to make a large attendance of the heads of the people proper in itself, and they would moreover serve as witnesses that Aaron and his sons were not intruders into the sacred office, but solemnly and specially inducted into it, according to the express appointment of Jehovah himself.

5. *This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done.* q. d. I am now about to enter upon that work which the Lord commanded when I was with him in the holy mount, Ex. 29. 4. And so throughout the remainder of the present chapter, whatever portions of it are left unexplained, they will be found illustrated in the corresponding chapter in Exodus.

6. *Washed them with water.* That is, caused them to wash themselves. See upon this ceremony of ablution the Note on Ex. 29. 4. We may give, however, in this connexion the following note from the Pictorial Bible. 'Here the ceremonies of consecration commence with ablutions, and we have seen that the priests were required to bathe their hands and feet whenever they entered the tabernacle. This, doubtless, was not merely to ensure physical cleanness, but also to symbolize that spiritual purity with which man should appear before God. The present washing, however, is distinguished from the daily ablution; inasmuch as the whole person seems now to have been washed, but only the hands and feet on common occasions. The idea of the fitness of such a practice is so obvious, that it has been more or less in use in most religious systems. We find at the heathen temples, lavers of a similar use to this at the tabernacle. The Egyptian priests washed themselves with cold water twice every day, and

twice at night; the Greeks had their sprinklings, the Romans their lustrations and lavations; the ancient Christians practised ablution before receiving the sacrament, and also bathed their eyes on entering a church. The Roman Catholic church retains something of the practice of ablution before, and sometimes after mass; and Calmet says that the holy-water vessels at the entrance of their churches are in imitation of the laver of the tabernacle. The oriental Christians have also their solemn washings on particular occasions, such as Good Friday. The practice of ablution was adopted by Mahommed in a very full sense; for his followers are not only obliged to perform their ablutions before they enter a mosque, but before they commence the prayers, wherever offered, which they are required to repeat five times each day. This is certainly the most burdensome system of ablution which ever existed in ancient or modern times. The Hindoos also rejoice in the purifying virtues of their idolized Ganges, and wash also in other waters, because they believe that such will be equally effectual, if, whilst they bathe, they say, 'O Ganges, purify me!' In fact, nothing is or has been more common than ablutions in the worship which different nations render to their gods; and there are few acts connected with their service which are not begun or ended with some rite symbolical of purification. In the religion of classical antiquity, the priest was obliged to prepare himself by ablution for offering sacrifice; for which purpose there was usually water at the entrance of the temple. In very ancient times the priests seem to have previously bathed themselves in some river or stream. But such ablutions were only necessary in sacrifices to the celestial gods, sprinkling being sufficient for the terrestrial and infernal deities. (See Banier's 'Mythology of the Ancients,' vol. 1. p. 271.)—We may here observe, that, from the obligation of the priests to wash their feet before entering the tabernacle, and for other reasons, it has been inferred that they officiated with bare feet. It is also observed, that in the enumeration of the articles of the priestly dress, sandals are not mentioned, neither does Josephus in his account speak of them. It is true that Plutarch represents the Hebrew priest as officiating with buskins; but his authority is of the least possible weight on such a subject. We believe ourselves that the priests did officiate barefoot, although our conviction does not proceed from the reasons thus stated; but rather from the knowledge that it was in very ancient times, as at present, a common mark of respect in the East to uncover the feet. (See Note on Exod. 3. 5.) Even classical heathenism affords instances of this usage. 'Adore and sacrifice with naked feet,' was a maxim of Pythagoras, which he probably brought, with the rest of his philosophy, from the East. The temple of Diana at Crete might not be entered with covered feet; the Roman ladies were obliged to be barefoot in the temple of Vesta; and the suppliants went barefoot to the temple of Jupiter when they prayed for rain. The Mohammedans, and the Asiatic and Abyssinian Christians, invariably take off their shoes before they enter a place of worship, as do the Brahmins of India when they enter their temples. As to the Jews themselves, it is impossible to say, unless by inference, what they did in the tabernacle; but it seems fair to conclude that they did the same as afterwards in the Temple, and that they there officiated barefoot we have the concurrent testimony of various writers. Maimonides says that none were allowed to enter the Temple with shoes, or with unclean feet, or with a staff, or in the dress in which they worked at their respective callings. The Talmud is positive on the same subject, saying that no priest or layman might enter with shoes; but as this regulation, in

7 [f]And he put upon him the [g]coat, and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and put the ephod upon him, and he girded him with the curious girdle of the ephod, and bound *it* unto him therewith.

8 And he put the breast-plate upon him: also he [h]put in the breast-plate the Urim and the Thummim.

9 [i]And he put the mitre upon his head; also upon the mitre, *even* upon his fore-front, did he put the golden plate, the holy crown; as the LORD [k]commanded Moses.

10 [i]And Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed the tabernacle and all that *was* therein, and sanctified them.

11 And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all his vessels, both the laver and his foot, to sanctify them.

12 And he [m]poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanctify him.

[f] Exod. 29. 5. [g] Exod. 28. 4. [h] Exod. 28. 30. [i] Exod. 29. 6.

[k] Exod. 28. 37, &c. [l] Exod. 30. 26, 27, 28, 29. [m] ch. 21. 10, 12. Exod. 29. 7, and 30. 30, Ps. 133. 2.

---

conjunction with their way of life and the thinness of their official dress, was injurious to their health, there was a small apartment or closet, called the 'stove' or 'fire-room,' which had a heated floor, on which the priests might occasionally warm their feet. (See Saurin's 'Dissertations,' 44. and 45.; Calmet's 'Commentaire Littéral,' on Exod. 3. 5, and 30. 18, &c.)'

7. *And he put upon him the coat, &c.* It would seem that Moses on this occasion, by an extraordinary commission from God, executed himself the office of High-Priest on this and the six following days.

8. *He put in the breast-plate the Urim and Thummim.* See Note on Ex. 28. 30.

10. *Anointed the tabernacle.* Probably by putting his finger in the oil and then smearing it over the tabernacle and its utensils.

11. *Anointed the altar and all his vessels, to sanctify them.* The altar by these rites was sanctified, so that thenceforward through the sacrifices daily offered upon it, atonement might be made for the sins of the people, whereas afterwards the altar was to be considered as sanctifying the gifts and oblations laid upon it, according to Mat. 23. 19, 'Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that *sanctifieth the gift*.'

12. *Poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanctify him.* That is, to set him apart to his office. 'From comparing this verse with v. 30, it is thought that Aaron alone was anointed on the head, his sons being merely sprinkled; or, as we should understand, that Aaron was sprinkled in common with his sons, but that the anointing or pouring out of oil upon his head was an addition peculiar to him. The custom of setting persons apart for particularly dignified or holy offices, by anointing, seems to have originated in the East, and in most cases appears to have symbolized the effusion of the gifts and graces which they were presumed to receive from heaven to qualify them for distinguished offices. Hence this sacred anointing seems to have been considered as investing with a peculiar sanctity the person on whom it had been conferred. We see this in the reverence with which 'the Lord's anointed' is on all occasions mentioned in Scripture. The persons set apart to their offices by anointing, among the Hebrews, were the priests, kings, and prophets; but there is some doubt about the latter, to which we shall have occasion to advert, as well as to the unction of the kings. The precious oil seems to have been more profusely expended on Aaron than

13 [n] And Moses brought Aaron's sons, and put coats upon them, and girded them with girdles, and put bonnets upon them; as the LORD commanded Moses.

14 [o] And he brought the bullock for the sin-offering: and Aaron and his sons [p] laid their hands upon the head of the bullock for the sin-offering.

15 And he slew *it;* [q] and Moses took the blood, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger, and purified the altar, and poured the blood at the bottom of the altar, and sanctified it, to make reconciliation upon it.

16 [r] And he took all the fat that *was* upon the inwards, and the caul *above* the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and Moses burned *it* upon the altar.

17 But the bullock, and his hide, his flesh, and his dung, he burnt with fire without the camp; as the LORD [s] commanded Moses.

18 ¶ [t] And he brought the ram for the burnt-offering: and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram.

19 And he killed *it;* and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about.

20 And he cut the ram into pieces; and Moses burnt the head, and the pieces, and the fat.

21 And he washed the inwards and the legs in water; and Moses burnt the whole ram upon the altar: it *was* a burnt-sacrifice for a sweet savour, *and* an offering made by fire unto the LORD; [u] as the LORD commanded Moses.

22 ¶ And [w] he brought the other ram, the ram of consecration: and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram.

23 And he slew *it;* and Moses took of the blood of it, and put *it* upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot.

24 And he brought Aaron's son's, and Moses put of the blood upon the tip of their right ear, and upon the thumbs of their right hands, and upon the great toes of their right feet: and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about.

25 [x] And he took the fat, and the rump, and all the fat that *was* upon the inwards, and the caul *above* the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and the right shoulder:

26 [y] And out of the basket of unleavened bread, that *was* before the LORD, he took one unleavened cake, and a cake of oiled bread, and

[n] Exod. 29. 8. 9. [o] Exod. 29. 10. Ezek. 43. 19. [p] ch. 4. 4. [q] Exod. 29. 12, 36. ch. 4. 7. Ezek. 43. 20, 26. Heb. 9. 22. [r] Exod. 29. 13. ch. 4. 8. [s] ch. 4. 11, 12. Exod. 29. 14. [t] Exod. 29. 15

[u] Exod. 29. 18. [w] Exod. 29. 19. 31. [x] Exod. 29. 22. [y] Exod. 29. 23.

---

in any other application. We learn from Ps. 132. 2, that being poured on his head, it ran down on his beard and to the collar of his coat (the robe of the ephod)—not to the skirts of his garments, as there translated. The Jewish writers have many fancies about the mode in which the oil was applied, into which we need not enter. If the high-priest was, as some state, fully robed before anointed, the mitre might have been taken off for that ceremony: but others think that the tiara was not put on till after the anointing.'—*Pict. Bib.*

15. *And he slew it; and Moses took, &c.* Heb. וישחט וירקח משה *va-yis'hât va-yikka'h moshëh.* It would not perhaps be easy to show that there is any thing contrary to the grammatical construction in rendering this passage, 'And Moses slew it, and took,' &c., but as the versions are all in favor of the present rendering, we prefer to abide by it.

one wafer, and put *them* on the fat, and upon the right shoulder:

27 And he put all [z] upon Aaron's hands, and upon his sons' hands, and waved them *for* a wave-offering before the LORD.

28 [a] And Moses took them from off their hands, and burnt *them* on the altar upon the burnt-offering: they *were* consecrations for a sweet savour: it *is* an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

29 And Moses took the breast, and waved it *for* a wave-offering before the LORD: *for* of the ram of consecration it was Moses' [b] part; as the LORD commanded Moses.

30 And [c] Moses took of the anointing oil, and of the blood which *was* upon the altar, and sprinkled *it* upon Aaron, *and* upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon his sons' garments with him; and sanctified Aaron, *and* his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him.

31 ¶ And Moses said unto Aaron and to his sons, [d] Boil the flesh *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; and there eat it with the bread that *is* in the basket of consecrations, as I commanded, saying, Aaron and his sons shall eat it.

32 [e] And that which remaineth of the flesh and of the bread shall ye burn with fire.

33 And ye shall not go out of the door of the tabernacle of the congregation *in* seven days, until the days of your consecration be at an end: for [f] seven days shall he consecrate you.

34 [g] As he hath done this day, *so* the LORD hath commanded to do, to make an atonement for you.

35 Therefore shall ye abide *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation day and night seven days, and [h] keep the charge of the LORD, that ye die not: for so I am commanded.

36 So Aaron and his sons did all things which the LORD commanded by the hand of Moses.

[z] Exod. 29. 24, &c. [a] Exod. 29. 25. [b] Exod. 29. 26. [c] Exod. 29. 21, and 30. 30. Numb. 3. 3. [d] Exod. 29. 31, 32.

[e] Exod. 29. 34. [f] Exod. 29. 30, 35. Ezek. 43. 25, 26. [g] Heb. 7. 16. [h] Num. 3. 7, and 9. 19. Deut. 11. 1. 1 Kings 2. 3.

33. *Ye shall not go out of the door of the tabernacle in seven days.* That is, out of the *court* of the tabernacle, with which *door* of the tabernacle is often synonimous. The Heb. has מפתח *mippethah*, which might as well be rendered 'from the door,' as 'out of the door,' for the consecration was not performed *within*, but *at* the door of the tabernacle. The Gr. has very properly απο θυρας, *from the door.*——¶ *For seven days shall he consecrate you.* That is, Moses shall consecrate you; for the command of God is here referred to, and cited according to the sense, Ex. 29. 35. So v. 34, 'as he (Moses) hath done.' The number *seven* among the Hebrews was the number of *perfection*, and the seven days of consecration implied a *full* and *perfect* consecration to the sacerdotal office, and correctly intimated, moreover, that their *whole lives* were to be devoted to this solemn service.

34. *As he hath done this day.* That is, as hath been done; another instance of that *indefinite* phraseology of which we have before so frequently spoken. See Note on Lev. 1. 5. Thus also 2 Sam. 15. 31, 'And one told David,' i. e. it was told him. Mark 10. 3, 'And they brought,' compared with Mat. 19. 13, 'Then were brought.'

CHAPTER IX.

Aaron's entrance on the Priestly Office.

1. *It came to pass on the eighth day.* Not upon the eighth day of the month,

CHAPTER IX.

AND [a] it came to pass on the eighth day, *that* Moses called Aaron and his sons, and the elders of Israel;

2 And he said unto Aaron, [b] Take thee a young calf for a sin-offering, [c] and a ram for a burnt-offering, without blemish, and offer *them* before the LORD.

3 And unto the children of Israel thou shalt speak, saying, [d] Take ye a kid of the goats for a sin-offering; and a calf and a lamb, *both* of the first year, without blemish, for a burnt-offering;

4 Also a bullock and a ram for peace-offerings, to sacrifice before the LORD; and [e] a meat-offering mingled with oil: for [f] to-day the LORD will appear unto you.

5 ¶ And they brought *that* which Moses commanded before the tabernacle of the congregation: and all the congregation drew near and stood before the LORD.

6 And Moses said, This *is* the thing which the LORD commanded that ye should do: and [g] the glory of the LORD shall appear unto you.

7 And Moses said unto Aaron, Go unto the altar, and [h] offer thy sin-offering, and thy burnt-offering, and make an atonement for thyself,

[a] Ezek. 43. 27. [b] ch. 4. 3, and 8. 14. Exod. 29. 1. [c] ch. 8. 18. [d] ch. 4. 23. Ezra 6. 17, and 10. 19.

[e] ch. 2. 4. [f] ver. 6 23. Exod. 29. 43. [g] ver. 23. Exod 24. 16. [h] ch. 4. 3. 1 Sam. 3. 14. Heb. 5. 3, and 7. 27, and 9. 7.

---

but on the first day after their consecration, which occupied seven days, and before which they were deemed unfit to minister in holy things, being considered in a state of imperfection. All creatures, for the most part, were considered as in a state of uncleanness and imperfection *seven* days, and perfected on the *eighth*. So here the priests were not admitted until the eighth day to minister in their office. ——¶ *And the elders of Israel.* Gr. *την γερουσιαν Ισραηλ, the eldership or senate of Israel.* These, together with a large body of the people, were assembled in the court, v. 23, 24, where it was the duty of the elders to impose their hands upon the sin-offering of the congregation.

2. *Take thee a young calf for a sin-offering.* Heb. בן בקר *ben bâkâr, son of the herd.* This offering is supposed by the Jewish writers to have been appointed for Aaron in person, in reference to his sin in the matter of the golden calf. But it may be sufficient to hold that this offering respected merely the general frailties and imperfections of Aaron, as one of a fallen race, who, though an high-priest by office, yet stood in as much need of an atonement as any of the people whom he represented.

4. *To-day the Lord shall appear unto you.* That is, the visible glory of the Lord will appear in the increased effulgence of the cloudy pillar resting over the tabernacle, and also in sending forth from the midst of the cloud a fire to consume the offerings upon the altar. Chal. 'The glory of the Lord shall be revealed.' Comp. v. 6. By reason of this expected appearance, the people were to prepare and sanctify themselves by every kind of sacrifice, in allusion to which it is said of a still more glorious appearance, of which this was a shadow, 1 John 2. 3, 'We know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself as he is pure.'

5. *All the congregation drew near and stood before the Lord.* That is, before the sanctuary, in the court; before the dwelling-place of the Lord's glory.

7. *Go unto the altar and offer, &c.* These further prescribed offerings, so immediately succeeding those which had been offered at the consecration, show very forcibly the consciousness

and for the people: and [i] offer the offering of the people, and make an atonement for them; as the LORD commanded.

8 ¶ Aaron therefore went unto the altar, and slew the calf of the sin-offering, which *was* for himself.

9 [k] And the sons of Aaron brought the blood unto him: and he dipped his finger in the blood, and [l] put *it* upon the horns of the altar, and poured out the blood at the bottom of the altar:

10 [m] But the fat, and the kidneys, and the caul *above* the liver of the sin-offering, he burnt upon the altar; [n] as the LORD commanded Moses.

11 [o] And the flesh and the hide he burnt with fire without the camp

12 And he slew the burnt-offering; and Aaron's sons presented unto him the blood, [p] which he sprinkled round about upon the altar.

13 [q] And they presented the burnt-offering unto him, with the pieces thereof, and the head: and he burnt *them* upon the altar.

14 [r] And he did wash the inwards and the legs, and burnt *them* upon the burnt-offering on the altar.

15 ¶ [s] And he brought the people's offering, and took the goat which *was* the sin-offering for the people, and slew it, and offered it for sin, as the first.

[i] ch. 4. 16, 20. Heb. 5. 1. [k] ch. 8. 15. [l] See ch. 4. 7. [m] ch. 8. 16. [n] ch. 4. 8. [o] ch. 4. 11, and 8. 17. [p] ch. 1. 5, and 8. 19. [q] ch. 8. 20. [r] ch. 8. 21. [s] ver. 3. Isa. 53. 10. Heb. 2. 17, and 5. 3.

---

which even the holiest and most accepted persons ought to entertain of their own sinfulness. Those who are holy by office are still to know and confess that they are sinners by nature, even as others.

8. *Aaron therefore went unto the altar.* These being the first offerings that were ever offered by the Levitical priesthood, according to the newly enacted law of sacrifices, the manner of offering them is particularly related, that it might appear how exactly they agreed with the institution. Aaron was first required to make expiation for himself, that he might thereby be qualified to do it for the people.—— ¶ *And slew the calf.* This often implies no more than ordered, procured, or superintended the slaying. See Note on Lev. 1. 5. But in the present instance it is not unreasonable to suppose that Aaron performed the slaughter in person.

9. *The sons of Aaron brought the blood unto him.* Having caught the blood in basins, as it run from the victim when killed, they brought it to him as he stood waiting at the altar. The ceremonies that followed have been already described.

10. *He burnt upon the altar.* He laid them in order upon the altar, that they might be consumed, not with ordinary fire, but with that which was ere long to come forth from before the Lord; for common fire, it would seem, was no longer to be used when Aaron's sacrifice began, as it had been all along before. Still it is possible that the miraculous fire did not issue forth till the holocaust of the people came to be be offered, v. 24.

15. *He brought the people's offering* Having duly presented the requisite offering for himself, he was now prepared to officiate in behalf of the people, which he did according to the mode prescribed, Ex. 29. 39, 40. Lev. chs. 1. 2. and 7., on which see Notes.—— ¶ *Took the goat—and offered it for sin* Heb. וַיִּתְאַהוּ *ye'hatteëhu.* It is the same term with that which occurs Lev. 8. 15, and which is both here and there rendered by the Gr. καθαρισεν, *cleansed.* The Heb. word חטא *'hâtâ*, in its radical or Kal form, signifies *to sin;* while in the Piel form it is used to signify *purg-*

16 And he brought the burnt-offering, and offered it [t] according to the manner.

17 And he brought [u] the meat-offering, and took an handful thereof, and burnt *it* upon the altar, [x] beside the burnt-sacrifice of the morning.

18 He slew also the bullock and the ram *for* [y] a sacrifice of peace-offerings, which *was* for the people: and Aaron's sons presented unto him the blood, which he sprinkled upon the altar round about,

19 And the fat of the bullock, and of the ram, the rump, and that which covereth *the inwards*, and the kidneys, and the caul *above* the liver:

20 And they put the fat upon the breasts, [z] and he burnt the fat upon the altar:

21 And the breasts and the right shoulder Aaron waved [a] *for* a wave-offering before the LORD; as Moses commanded.

22 And Aaron lifted up his hand toward the people, [b] and blessed them; and came down from offer-

[t] ch. 1. 3, 10. [u] ver. 4. ch. 2. 1, 2. [x] Ex. 29. 38. [y] ch. 3. 1, &c.

[z] ch. 3. 5. 16. [a] Exod. 29. 24, 26. ch. 7. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34. [b] Numb. 6. 23. Deut. 21. 5. Luke 24. 50.

---

ing away sin by sacrifice. (See Note on Lev. 6. 20.) Thus Gen. 31. 39, 'That which was torn of beasts, *I bare the loss of it* (אטנה *a'hattënah, I expiated, atoned, made satisfaction for it*).' Ps. 51. 7, '*Purge me* (תחטאני *te'hatteëni*) with hyssop, and I shall be clean.' Lev. 8. 15, 'And Moses *purified* (ויחטא *ye'hattë*) the altar and sanctified it.'

16. *According to the manner.* Heb. כמשפט *kammishpât, according to the judgment or ordinance.* See Note on Lev. 5. 10. Gr. ως καθηκει, *as it was fit.* The ordinance alluded to is found in the general law of the first chapter.

17. *Beside the burnt sacrifice of the morning.* That is, in addition to the daily sacrifice of the lamb, which was not to be superseded by the extra offerings of this or any other occasion.

19. *That which covereth, &c.* 'The fat that covereth the inwards' is the fat thin membrane extended over the intestines, and attached to the concave part of the liver, called the *omentum*, or caul. And by 'the caul above the liver,' is commonly understood, after the Septuagint, the great lobe of the liver (*major lobus hepatis*), which, although part of the liver itself, may very properly be rendered 'the lobe over' or 'by the liver.' As to the caul, it was a common offering in the sacrifices of the ancient heathen; and Strabo remarks, that the Persians, in their sacrifices, offered nothing else upon the altar. Calmet, who gives these instances in his 'Commentaire Littéral,' cites Athenæus in evidence that the ancients ate the liver covered with, or enfolded in, the caul; and he thinks it probable that the liver of the victim was, in the same manner, wrapped up in the caul before it was laid upon the altar; and that this is what Moses means by the 'caul above' or upon the liver.

22. *Aaron lifted up his hand toward the people, and blessed them.* By imploring, and then pronouncing the divine blessing upon them. The solemnity of blessing the people in the name of the Lord appertained especially to the priestly office; Deut. 10. 8, 'The Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto him, and *to bless in his name* unto this day.' The form of the benediction is given Num. 6. 23, 27. Considered as a type, this was accomplished by our great high-priest, Christ Jesus, when, having finished his ministry on earth, 'he lifted up his hands and blessed' his disciples, at his ascension into heaven, Luke 24. 50.——¶ *And came down.* That is, from the bank or elevation

ing of the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering, and peace-offerings.

23 And Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out, and blessed the people: [c] and the glory of the LORD appeared unto all the people.

24 And [d] there came a fire out from before the LORD, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: *which* when all the people saw, [e] they shouted, and fell on their faces.

[c] ver. 6. Numb. 14. 10, and 16. 19, 42.

[d] Gen. 4. 4. Judg. 6. 21. 1 Kings 18. 38. 2 Chron. 7. 1. Ps. 20. 3. [e] 1 Kings 18. 39. 2 Chron 7, 3. Ezra 3. 11.

---

which formed the ascent to the altar, as steps were forbidden.

23. *Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle.* Aaron, the priest, went in according to the law, Ex. 30. 7, 9, to burn incense on the golden altar; Moses went in with Aaron, in all likelihood to instruct him in the manner of the service that was to be performed there, such as burning the incense, lighting the lamps, setting in order the shew-bread, &c., that he might instruct his sons in it.——¶ *The glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people.* That is, the visible sign of God's glorious presence, indicated either by the fire mentioned in the next verse, or by the more luminous appearance of the cloudy pillar, as in Ex. 16. 10, and 40. 34, or by both. It was a token of God's gracious acceptance of them and of their services, as in 1 Kings 8. 10—12. The miraculous fire now sent forth from the divine presence, was, according to the Hebrews, kept alive upon the altar till the time of Solomon. Under the second temple, the Jews confess that the sacred fire was wanting.

24. *They shouted, &c.* From the combined effect of wonder and joy; devoutly and ardently giving thanks to God for this mark of his special favor. Thus on a similar occasion, 2 Chron. 27. 3, 'When all the sons of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord shone upon the house, they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground, upon the pavement, and worshipped and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever.' Had they not been previously taught to expect some extraordinary expressions of the divine regard, they would probably have been terrified as Gideon and Manoah were; but being prepared, they were filled with triumph and exultation, and rent the air with their shouts.

CHAPTER X.

We are called, in the present chapter, to pass by a melancholy transition from a scene of high festive, but holy, rejoicing, to a scene of awful judgment and heart-rending sorrow. The tabernacle had been finished; Aaron and his four sons, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, had been consecrated to the priesthood; the victims had been slain; Moses and Aaron had solemnly blessed the congregation; the divine requirements had all been complied with; and in attestation of God's acceptance of their services, his glory had appeared to all the people, and the fire of heaven had descended upon the altar and kindled a flame never to be quenched. In the midst of these hallowed solemnities, when all the assembled host were bowing before the Lord, and giving vent to expressions of profound but chastened joy, an act of rash, presumptuous, and sacrilegious daring on the part of Nadab and Abihu, in a moment turns the scene of worship into one of woe, and spreads sackcloth over the tabernacle! Scarcely had the celestial fire come down in mercy to consume the sacrifice, when again it descends in wrath to consume the sacrificers! This tragical event is thus briefly but distinctly recorded by Moses, whose

characteristic it is neither to extenuate nor set down aught in malice; 'And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord.' The words are few, but of fearfully solemn import, and the whole narrative presents a large theme of salutary practical remark and admonition. The principal reflections suggested by the mournful occurrence will be adduced in the course of our comments on the several verses; but we may properly pause, at the outset, to consider somewhat particularly the nature, circumstances, and grounds of the offence which drew down such a terrible infliction of wrath upon the perpetrators. Whatever may be determined as to the precise nature of the crime, it is clear that it was aggravated by the character of those by whom it was committed. These were the sons, the two eldest sons, of Aaron the high priest. They were, from their relation to Aaron, men of name and note in Israel; and they had formerly been honored with the high distinction of accompanying Moses and their father to the summit of the hallowed mount, where they were favored with a vision of God, such as had never before been accorded to mortal eyes; Ex. 24. 9. 'Then went up Moses and Aaron, *Nadab and Abihu*, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and they saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire-stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness.' None of the seventy elders are named; but Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, from their pre-eminence in the congregation, are expressly designated. Again, they had just been consecrated, along with their father, to the dignity of the priestly office. They had just been assisting him and Moses in the sacred offerings. They had been prominent actors in the solemnities of an occasion which should above all others have filled *their* souls with reverence and holy awe. However it might have been with others in the congregation, we can scarcely imagine that any but the devoutest sentiments should have penetrated *their* spirits in view of the transactions in which they were engaged. Yet in the midst of it all they sinned a sin, the enormity of which is most effectually proclaimed by the tremendous punishment which it immediately drew after it. They were struck dead with their censers in their hands, without a moment's warning! What a fearful exhibition of the truth, that God's jealousy burns fiercest about his altar!

But the question occurs as to the real nature of the offence for which they perished. In what did it consist?—a point on which it is not easy to give a perfectly satisfactory decision. The text simply informs us that they 'offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not.' What this was we shall shortly endeavor to show; but we may here remark, that in all probability their crime was of a *complicated* nature. From a careful inspection of the context, it would appear, that their sin is not to be resolved into any *one* form of disobedience, but that it involved a number. And in the first place, it would seem that there was ground for the belief suggested by most commentators, that they had *indulged too freely in wine*. This seems to be reasonably inferred from the solemn prohibition, v. 9, 10, 'Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations: And that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean.' The conjecture therefore is very plausible, that they had rendered themselves incapable

of the due discharge of their duty by intemperance; that they had partaken of the drink-offerings to a criminal excess; and thus become incapacitated to put a difference between holy and unholy, and between clean and unclean. If there be truth in this supposition, what a commentary does it afford on the pernicious effects of stimulating liquors, especially when used by the ministers of the altar! By clouding the moral perceptions, and inflaming the passions, they render their willing subject capable of any sacrilege or impiety, and thus expose him to the avenging stroke of an outraged Divinity!

At the same time, we should hardly infer from the tenor of the sacred story, that this, although an element, was the essence of their crime. There is some reason to suppose that, apart from the quality of the fire which they brought, there was a rash intrusion, and a reckless irregularity in their going forward to officiate at the time, and in the manner they did. The whole transaction, as recorded, has an air of abruptness and precipitancy, as if they rushed upon the service without waiting for instructions, either from Moses or Aaron; and as if they were encroaching upon the functions of the high-priest. If by the phrase 'offered before the Lord,' be meant, as some suppose, that they advanced within the most Holy Place, and there presumed to offer incense before the Shekinah, this certainly was a bold invasion of Aaron's prerogative, and one that would of course expose them to be at once cut off for their hardihood. This idea receives some countenance from Lev. 16. 1, 2, where we are told that 'the Lord spake unto Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they offered before the Lord, and died: and the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the vail, before the mercy-seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not: for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat.' Whether this be the correct inference or not, we have no evidence from any other part of the ritual that more than *one* priest was to officiate in burning incense at the same time, and here they are represented as entering *together* upon a service to which it does not appear that *either* of them was now called.

But laying aside every thing that is uncertain in the affair, we find a definite and aggravated offence laid to their charge. They sinned by offering strange fire before the Lord. Instead of filling their censers with coals from the altar, where a supernatural fire had been kindled from heaven, and which was always to be used in burning incense, they contemptuously disregarded this ordinance, and filled their vessels with common fire. This was the head and front of their offending, whatever minor accessaries of guilt may have accompanied it.

But where, it is said, is this act expressly forbidden? Is it any where ordered, in so many words, that only one kind of fire should be employed in the services of the sanctuary? And if there was no express precept violated, wherein consisted the essential criminality of their conduct? In reply to this, we answer (1.) That in the phrase 'which he commanded not,' we recognize, according to the idiom of the sacred writers, a clear intimation that the thing in question had been *expressly forbidden*. This is the true force of the expression, as we shall evince in our note on the passage. (2.) In Ex. 30. 9, it is commanded that no 'strange incense' should be presented, and the implication would be inevitable, from the nature of the case, that 'strange fire' was equally contrary to the divine will. But not only so. From Lev. 16. 12, 13, we learn that on the day of atonement, the priest was to 'take a censer *full of burning coals of fire from off the altar* before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and

CHAPTER X.

AND [a]Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, [b]took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered [c]strange fire before the LORD, which he commanded them not.

[a] ch. 16. 1, and 22. 9. Numb. 3. 3, 4, and 26. 61. 1 Chron. 24. 2. [b] ch. 16. 12. Num. 16. 18.

[c] Exod. 30. 9.

bring it within the vail: And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not.' The order contained in this passage was indeed given subsequent to the event we are now considering, but the presumption obviously is, that this was the *standing usage* which had been ordained from the first institution of the legal rites, and as to which it is not conceivable that Aaron's sons should have been ignorant. And as the fire miraculously kindled on the altar was to be kept perpetually alive, what other inference could have been drawn, than that from this source was all the fire to be derived which was employed in the sacred rites? The fact that we do not meet with any such injunction in express terms, does not at all abate the force of the probability that they were perfectly aware that such was the will of God in regard to this matter.

The penalty which was inflicted upon the transgressors was indeed severe. But the case called for severity. The rank and station of the offenders was a high aggravation of their crime. It was their duty to set an example of scrupulous regard to the known will of God. They had been admitted to more intimate communion with God than others, and had seen more of the terrors of his power, more of the wonders of his grace. Moreover, the Levitical institute had been just established, and was now for the first time going into operation. It behoved, therefore, that every thing should be done in exact conformity to the divine prescription. The sanctity of the whole system would be gone at once, if the ministry of it might with impunity presume, in its setting out, to dispense with any of its fixed regulations. As, then, the deed was daring and high-handed in the extreme, so the expiation was proportionably fearful; and the whole transaction most forcibly impresses upon us the apposite admonition of the apostle, 'Let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear; for our God is a consuming fire.'

The Sin and Death of Nadab and Abihu.

1. *Took either of them his censer.* Or, 'fire-pan;' a vessel in which coals of fire were put, to be sprinkled over with frankincense, in order to create an agreeable odor in the sanctuary. The event here mentioned probably occurred at the time of the evening sacrifice, when the lamps were lighted, and incense burned, unless, as some suppose, one part of their offence was doing that at another time of day which was appointed to be done in the morning or evening.——¶ *Offered strange fire.* That is, other fire than that which the Lord had commanded. The Lord had sent a supernatural fire to consume the first victims offered to him. This was to be kept perpetually alive, and from it only were the coals to be taken for the burning of incense. Such, at least, might have been gathered to be the will of God, although the injunction, in so many words, is not expressly recorded in any part of the preceding narrative. It is probable, however, that an explicit command to this effect had been previously given by Moses, though not mentioned. The command was afterwards expressly recorded, Lev. 16. 12, in allusion to which it is said, Rev. 8. 5,

2 And there [d] went out fire from the LORD, and devoured them, and they died before the LORD.

3 Then Moses said unto Aaron, This *is it* that the LORD spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them [e] that come nigh me, and before all

[d] ch 9. 24. Numb. 16. 35. 2 Sam. 6. 7.

[e] Exod. 19. 22, and 29. 43. ch. 21. 6, 17, 21. Isai. 52. 11. Ezek. 20. 41, and 42. 13.

'The angel took the censer and filled it with *fire of the altar*.'——¶ *Which he commanded them not.* This, by a figure of speech called *meiosis*, is probably equivalent to saying, 'which the Lord had pointedly forbidden.' The following are instances of a similar usage: Ps. 78. 50. 'He spared not their soul from death;' i. e. he destroyed them with desolating judgments. Prov. 12. 3. 'A man shall not be established by wickedness;' i. e. he shall be overthrown. Prov. 17. 21. 'The father of a fool hath no joy;' i. e. hath grief and sorrow. In these cases under a negative form of expression, the contrary affirmative is emphatically implied.

2. *There went out fire from before the Lord.* That is, from the Shekinah, the symbol of the divine presence, before which they had presumed to offer the strange fire upon the altar of incense. This stood in front of the most holy place, just without the vail.——¶ *And devoured them.* The action of the fire in this instance was peculiar, as neither their bodies nor their clothes were consumed by it. Targ. Jon. 'It burned their souls, but not their bodies.' It was a flash of preternatural fire from the cloud of glory that rested over the mercy-seat.——¶ *Died before the Lord.* That is, before the vail that covered the mercy-seat.

3. *This is it that the Lord spake.* It does not appear from the record that these precise words were anywhere previously spoken, although some suppose that reference is had to Ex. 19. 22, 'Let the priests which come near the Lord sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them.' Others again conceive that the words alluded to are found, Ex. 29. 43, 'And there will I meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory.' The words might have been previously spoken, but not written. Perhaps, however, all that is intended is, that this was the *spirit* and *purport* of what God had said, not on any particular occasion, but in the general tenor of his instructions to the priests.——¶ *I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me.* Heb. בקרבי אקדש *bikrobai ekkâdôsh, in my near ones will I be sanctified.* That is, those who approach near to God in the duties of a holy ministration. Thus the Priests and Levites were such as are described Ezek. 42. 13, as '*approaching* unto the Lord.' So also, Ex. 19. 22, 'Let the priests also, *which come near to the Lord*, sanctify themselves;' i. e. those whose office it is to come near to the Lord. So in 1 Pet. 4. 17, judgment is said to begin '*at the house of God*;' and in Ezek. 9. 6, '*at the sanctuary*.' God is said in the language of Scripture to be 'sanctified' by his people, when they demean themselves holily and uprightly before him, duly regarding and reverencing every thing by which he makes himself known; 1 Pet. 3. 15. '*Sanctify* the Lord God in your hearts,' &c. So also he is 'sanctified' when he righteously punishes those who transgress. Ezek. 27. 22, 'Behold, I am against thee, O Zidon, and I will be glorified in the midst of thee; and they shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall have executed judgments in her, and shall be *sanctified* in her.' So also Ezek. 38. 16. 23, 'I shall bring thee against my land, that the heathen may know me when I shall be *sanctified* in thee, O Gog, before their eyes. Then will I magnify myself, and *sanctify* myself; and I will be known in the eyes of many nations.' God will either be

the people I will be [f]glorified. [g]And Aaron held his peace.

4 And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of [h]Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, [i]carry your brethren from before the sanctuary out of the camp.

5 So they went near, and carried them in their coats out of the camp; as Moses had said.

[f] Isai. 49. 3. Ezek. 28. 22. John 13. 31, 32. and 14 13. 2 Thess. 1. 10. [g] Ps. 39. 9. [h] Exod. 6. 18, 22. Numb 3. 19. 30. [i] Luke 7. 12. Acts 5. 6, 9, 10, and 8. 12.

6 And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons, [k]Uncover not your heads, neither rend your clothes; lest ye die, and lest [l]wrath come upon all the people: but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the LORD hath kindled.

7 [m]And ye shall not go out from the door of the tabernacle of the

[k] Exod. 33 5. ch. 13. 45, and 21. 1. 10. Numb. 6. 6 7. Deut. 33. 9. Ezek. 24 16, 17. [l] Numb 16 22. 46. Josh. 7. 1, and 22. 18. 20. 2 Sam. 24. 1. [m] ch. 21. 12.

sanctified *by* all his creatures in a way of active reverence, obedience, and praise, or *upon* them in a way of vengeance and wrath.——¶ *And Aaron held his peace.* Heb. דמם *yiddom, was hushed, silent, quiescent.* The original word is that which occurs Josh. 10. 13, in reference to the *standing still* of the sun and moon at the command of Joshua, on which see Note. The meaning is that he yielded in quiet submission, without a murmur, to the just judgment of heaven in bereaving him of his sons. So the Psalmist, Ps. 34. 9. 'I *was dumb*, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it.'

4. *Carry your brethren from before, &c.* That is, your kinsmen. This order was given to the cousins of Nadab and Abihu, rather than to their immediate brethren, both that their feelings might be consulted, and that they might not be called off from their ministrations at the altar. Yet as these sons of Uzziel were merely Levites, and not priests, it would have been unlawful for them to enter into the sanctuary except in consequence of a special command of Moses.

5. *Carried them in their coats out of the camp.* That is, in the tunics or linen garments in which they ministered, and in which they were doubtless buried, as they would be considered as henceforth unfit for any kind of sacred service, whereas in ordinary cases the cast-off dresses of the priests were converted into wick for the lamps of the sanctuary.

6. *Uncover not your heads.* Heb. אל תפרעו *al tiphrâu.* Gr. ουκ αποκιδαρωσεσε, *put not off the mitres.* The original word for *uncover*, which primarily signifies to *make free*, and which is more fully explained in the Note on Jud. 5. 2, would seem also to imply a prohibition against letting the hair become disarrayed or dishevelled, as was customary in bewailing the dead. The meaning we suppose to be, 'Let none of the usual signs of grief or mourning be seen upon you;' for the reason, probably, that the crime of their brethren was so highly provoking to God, and so fully merited the punishment which he had inflicted, that their mourning might be considered as a reflection upon the divine justice towards the offenders. The rending of the clothes was another sign of sorrow, as appears from Lev. 13. 45, and 21. 10; 2 Sam. 13. 21.——¶ *Let your brethren, &c.* While Aaron and his sons, for official reasons, were forbidden to assume the badges of mourning, the congregation at large were permitted and commanded to do it. They must lament not only the loss of their priests, but especially the displeasure of God which had occasioned it.

congregation, lest ye die: [n] for the anointing oil of the LORD *is* upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses.

8 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Aaron, saying,

[n] Exod. 28. 41. ch. 8. 30.

9 [o] Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your generations:

[o] Ezek. 44. 21. Luke 1. 15. 1 Tim. 3. 3. Tit. 1. 7.

7. *The anointing oil of the Lord is upon you.* That is, ye are devoted by a solemn unction to the service of God, which is not to be omitted out of respect to any earthly relation; whereas, should you leave your official station before its duties are fully performed, it would be no other than showing greater affection and respect to a dead friend than to the living God. The injunction contained in these two verses seems to have become a standing law for the priests ever after. This is evident from Lev. 21. 10, 12, 'And he that is high priest among his brethren, upon whose head the anointing oil was poured, and that is consecrated to put on the garments, shall not uncover his head, nor rend his clothes. Neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, nor profane the sanctuary of his God; for the crown of the anointing oil of his God is upon him.'

8. *And the Lord spake unto Aaron.* Hitherto, the Lord on all such occasions had spoken to Moses; but now seeing that Aaron had been very observant of every thing commanded him, and perhaps with a design to afford him some consolation under his heavy affliction, he does him the honor to speak immediately to him, especially as the precept uttered had primary respect to the priests, of whom Aaron was head.

9. *Do not drink wine.* It is the general opinion of the Jewish commentators, and not improbable in itself, that Nadab and Abihu had drank wine to excess on the occasion which resulted in their death, and that the present prohibition was grounded upon the circumstance of their attempting to celebrate the divine service in a state of inebriation. The spirit of the precept requires of Gospel ministers that they be '*sober, not given to wine*,' 1 Tim. 3. 2. 3. 'Lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert judgment,' Prov. 31. 5; lest they 'err through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way,' Is. 28. 7. By its being forbidden to be used, however, on a particular occasion, it is implied that at other times it was not prohibited to them, as it was not expected that every priest should be a Nazarite. So under the Gospel, 1 Tim. 5. 23, 'Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities;' where, however, it will be noted that the precept is specially guarded, both in respect to the *quantity* and the *occasion*.——¶ *Nor strong drink.* Heb. שכר *shĕkâr*, from שכר *shâkar, to inebriate*, signifying any kind of intoxicating drink, whether made of *corn, apples, honey, dates*, or other *fruits*. One of the four prohibited drinks among the Mohammedans in India is called 'Sakar,' which signifies *intoxicating drink* in general, but especially *date wine*. The ancient Egyptians, as we learn from Herodotus, B. II. c. 77, made use of a liquor fermented from barley. Diod. Siculus, Lib. I. de Osir. observes that 'where any region did not admit the growth of the vine, a drink was prepared from barley, not much inferior in flavor and efficacy to wine.' From the original word, 'Sheker,' preserved in the Gr. and Lat. in the form of 'Sikera,' and 'Sicera,' is probably derived the English 'cider,' a term applied exclusively to the fermented juice of apples, and so also probably the word 'sugar,' from

10 And that ye may [p] put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean;

11 [q] And that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the LORD hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses.

12 ¶ And Moses spake unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar, and unto Ithamar, his sons that were left, Take [r] the meat-offering that remaineth of the offerings of the LORD made by fire, and eat it without leaven beside the altar: for [s] it *is* most holy:

13 And ye shall eat it in the holy place, because it *is* thy due, and thy sons' due, of the sacrifices of the LORD made by fire: for [t] so I am commanded.

[p] ch. 11. 47, and 20. 25. Jer. 15. 19. Ezek. 22. 26, and 44. 23. [q] Deut. 24. 8. Neh. 8. 2, 8, 9, 13. Jer. 18. 18. Mal. 2. 7. [r] Exod. 29. 2. ch. 6. 16. Numb. 18. 9, 10. [s] ch. 21. 22. [t] ch. 2. 3, and 6. 16.

14 And [u] the wave-breast and heave-shoulder shall ye eat in a clean place; thou, and thy sons, and thy daughters with thee: for *they be* thy due, and thy sons' due, *which* are given out of the sacrifices of peace-offerings of the children of Israel.

15 [x] The heave-shoulder and the wave-breast shall they bring, with the offerings made by fire of the fat, to wave *it for* a wave-offering before the LORD; and it shall be thine, and thy sons' with thee, by a statute for ever; as the LORD hath commanded.

16 ¶ And Moses diligently sought [y] the goat of the sin-offering, and behold, it was burnt: and he was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron *which were* left *alive*, saying,

[u] Exod. 29. 24, 26, 27. ch. 7. 31, 34. Numb. 18. 11. [x] ch. 7. 29, 30, 34. [y] ch. 9. 3, 15.

Fr. 'sucre.'——¶ *When ye go into the tabernacle.* That is, into the court of the tabernacle.——¶ *Lest ye die.* Lest ye do that which shall make you liable to be cut off by the vindictive hand of God, as in the melancholy instance before you.

10. *That ye may put difference, &c.* That is, that you may not by strong drink so cloud and darken your understandings, as to disqualify yourselves from distinguishing in your ministrations between that which is sacred and that which is common; or from 'separating between the precious and the vile.' As the word, however, in the original has the *causative* form, it implies also that they were not to incapacitate themselves from *teaching the people* to make the due discrimination. Thus Ezek. 44. 23, 'And they shall teach my people (the difference, or, how to distinguish) between the holy and the profane, and *cause them to discern* between the unclean and the clean.' With neglecting to do this, the priests are thus charged, Ezek. 22. 26, 'Her priests have violated my law and have profaned my holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and the profane, *neither have they showed difference* (taught the people the difference) between the unclean and the clean.'

12. *And Moses spake unto Aaron, &c.* The directions here given are repeated from those that were formerly delivered, both because they were as yet but little practised in the sacred ceremonies, and therefore needed fuller instruction, and because, from the pressure of their grief, they might possibly forget or neglect some part of the divine ordinances.

16. *Moses diligently sought.* Intimating that he suspected some deviation from the prescribed rule. That rule was, that if the blood of the sin-offering of the people was brought into the holy place, as was that of the sin-offering for the priest, then the flesh was to be burned without the camp;

17 [z] Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place, seeing it *is* most holy, and *God* hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the LORD?

18 Behold, [a] the blood of it was not brought in within the holy *place:* ye should indeed have eaten it in the holy *place*, [b] as I commanded.

19 And Aaron said unto Moses, Behold, [c] this day have they offered their sin-offering, and their burnt-offering before the LORD; and such things have befallen me: and *if* I had eaten the sin-offering to-day, [d] should it have been accepted in the sight of the LORD?

20 And when Moses heard *that*, he was content.

z ch. 6. 26, 29. a ch. 6. 30. b ch. 6. 26.

c ch. 9. 8, 12. d Jer. 6. 20, and 14. 12. Hos 9. 4. Mal. 1. 10, 13.

otherwise it was to be eaten by the priest in the holy place. Now in the present instance, the blood of the goat was not brought into the holy place, and yet, it seems, it was burned without the camp, whereas it ought to have been eaten.

17. *God hath given it to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation.* Gr. ινα αφελητε, *that ye may take away.* The phrase 'to bear iniquity,' often signifies to suffer punishment without forgiveness, as Ex. 28. 43, Lev. 20. 19; but in the present instance its meaning is the reverse of this. It signifies to *bear away, to procure the remission of*, the sins of the people. These sins were in some sense to be transferred to the priests as types of Christ, who 'bore our sins in his own body on the tree,' and of whom it is said, 'Behold the Lamb of God, that *taketh away* the sins of the world.'

19. *And Aaron said unto Moses*, &c. Moses charged the fault upon Eleazar and Ithamar, but it is probable they acted by Aaron's direction, and therefore he apologized for it. In this he makes his affliction his excuse. He supposed that as fasting before the Lord required a joyful frame of heart, his being at this time overwhelmed with sorrow, would render him unfit to eat of the holy things; that he could not do it without polluting them. And from the following passages it would appear that such an impression was not without foundation. When the hallowed things were brought according to the precept, Deut. 26. 14, the offerer was required to say, 'I have not eaten thereof *in my mourning*.' And when God would refuse the sacrifice of the wicked, he says, Hos. 9. 4, 'They shall be unto them *as the bread of mourners*, all that eat thereof shall be polluted.' Moses accordingly admitted the force of his plea, and acquiesced in it without hesitation.——¶ *Such things have befallen me.* Chal. 'Such tribulations have befallen me.' Jerus. Targ. 'Great sorrow hath this day befallen me, for that my two sons are dead, and I mourn for them.'——¶ *Should it have been accepted in the sight of the Lord?* Heb. היטב בעיני יהוה *hayitab beënë Yehovah, should it have been good in the eyes of Jehovah?* Jerus. Targ. 'Lo, if I had eaten the sin-offering to-day, were it possible that it could be acceptable and right before the Lord?'

20. *He was content.* Heb. ירטב בעיניו *yitab beënauv, it was good in his eyes*, Gr. ηρεσεν αυτῳ, *it pleased him.* So in other cases the letter of the law was dispensed with from the pressure of circumstances, as when David ate the show-bread, and Hezekiah admitted some that were not duly cleansed, to eat of the passover. 2 Chron. 30. 18–20.

REMARKS.—(1.) The most joyful and festive scenes may be suddenly clouded and turned to gloom by the

unexpected inroad of divine judgments. Let us therefore rejoice with trembling.

(1.) 'Which he commanded not.' How dangerous to innovate upon, or tamper with, the institutions of Heaven! God is peculiarly jealous of the purity of his ordinances, and watches with avenging vigilance around the worship of his altar. He will accept of no 'strange fire,' either in the matter or motives of the offerings presented to him.

(2.) Nadab and Abihu sinned by strange fire, and were punished by strange fire. Men's punishments are often marked by a striking analogy with their sins.

(3.) The mind and will of God is sometimes to be learned by *inference* from the general scope and tenor of his word, instead of express revelation; and we are not to suppose that an act or a practice may be lawfully indulged in, because it is not, in so many words, forbidden in the Scriptures. The question is, does the *general spirit* of the Bible forbid it? Of this, every man must judge as in the sight of God, and act accordingly.

(3.) It is of infinitely more consequence that the Most High should be sanctified, and his name glorified, than that the lives of our children, however dear to us, should be preserved.

(3.) The most comforting considerations under affliction, are those which are drawn from the word of God. There is no such source of consolation to mourners as his own precious truth.

(6.) 'Uncover not your heads.' The public concerns of God's glory should lie nearer our hearts than any private griefs, pleasures, or pursuits. The 'sorrow of the world' is often a great hindrance to the performance of religious duties.

CHAPTER XI.

The distinction of living creatures into *clean* and *unclean*, forming the basis of the dietetical system of the Jews, is the subject mainly treated in the present chapter. As this is a subject of great importance in the Mosaical institutes, we shall consider it at some length, particularly in reference to the *design* of the distinctions here established, and the *principles* involved in them. And we remark, in the outset, that the distinction of the animal tribes into *clean* and *unclean*, is founded not so much upon any thing in the nature of their *habits*, as more or less *cleanly*, but upon the circumstance, that one class of them was to be eaten for food, and the other not. This appears very plainly from vv. 46, 47, of this chapter, where the whole is summed up: 'This is the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living creature that moveth in the waters, and of every creature that creepeth upon the earth; to make a difference between the unclean and the clean, *and between* (i. e. even between) *the beast that may be eaten and the beast that may not be eaten.*' The latter clause explains the former, showing, that to say a beast may be eaten or not eaten, is equivalent to saying it is clean or unclean. These epithets are undoubtedly tantamount to *usual*, or *not usual, for food;* and consequently the distinction is not one with which *we* are entirely unacquainted; for by using some species of flesh-meat on our tables and rejecting others, we do in effect make this very distinction, though we do not express it in the same form of words. Indeed it does not appear that any animal is forbidden for food in this chapter, which Abraham or his descendants in any previous period were probably in the habit of eating; so that these precepts, like many others in the Pentateuch, merely convert national custom into positive law, with perhaps some slight exclusions on the one hand and admissions on the other.

If, then, to declare an animal clean or unclean, was merely to pronounce it fit or unfit to be eaten, it follows that there was nothing contemptuous or de-

grading in the use of the epithet *unclean* in this connexion. Nor is there any greater mistake than to suppose that the Jews were forbidden to keep unclean animals in their houses or stalls, or to have any thing to do with them. On the contrary, the camel, and the ass, and, in later times, the horse, were their common beasts of burden, though all the three species were unclean. Indeed, as Michaelis observes, in this sense man himself was the most *unclean* of all creatures, for he was lacking in the physical conditions of a clean animal, and none but a cannibal would ever think of such a horrid profanation as eating human flesh.

In considering the *design* of the enactments contained in this chapter, converting ancient customs into immutable laws, we may safely admit that it was mainly *to keep the Hebrews more perfectly separate from all other nations.* They were to continue a distinct people by themselves, dwelling all together in Palestine, and having as little intercourse as possible with the neighboring nations. There was, indeed, an end ulterior to this to be answered by their isolation from the rest of the world. God intended by this arrangement that they should be preserved from idolatry, and the concomitant vices then so fearfully rife among the Canaanitish tribes. This is clearly intimated Lev. 20. 25, 26, in immediate connexion with the warning, 'Ye shall not walk in the manners of the nations which I cast out before you: for they committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them.' He then proceeds to say, 'Ye shall therefore put difference between clean beasts and unclean, and between unclean fowls and clean: and ye shall not make your souls abominable by beast or by fowl, or by any manner of living thing that creepeth on the ground, which I have separated from you as unclean. And ye shall be holy unto me: for I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other people, that ye should be mine.' And in a subsequent part of the sacred narrative, we learn the actual effect that followed from the overleaping of this separating wall, Num. 25. 2, 3: 'And they called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: *and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods.* And Israel joined himself unto Baal-peor: and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel.'

To compass the object of separation, therefore, nothing could be better adapted than the enactment of laws interdicting the use of certain articles of food common among other tribes, which the rites of hospitality would naturally be sure to urge upon them. They were regulations, therefore, tending directly to break up all social intercourse between them and their idolatrous neighbors. 'Intimate friendships,' says Michaelis, 'are in most cases formed at table; and with the man with whom I can neither eat nor drink, let our intercourse in business be what it may, I shall seldom become so familiar as with him whose guest I am, and he mine. If we have, besides, from education, an abhorrence of the food which others eat, this forms a new obstacle to closer intimacy.'

The editor of the Pictorial Bible (Mr. Kitto) confirms this remark by the results of his own experience: 'The truth of this observation must be obvious to every person acquainted with the East, where, on account of the natives regarding as unclean many articles of food and modes of preparation in which Europeans indulge, travelers or residents find it impossible to associate intimately with conscientious Mohammedans or Hindoos. Nothing more effectual could be devised to keep one people distinct from another. It causes the difference between them to be ever present to the mind, touching, as it does, upon so many points of social and every-day contact; and it is therefore far more efficient in its results as a rule of distinction than any difference in doctrine,

worship, or morals, which men could entertain. While the writer of this note was in Asia, he had almost daily occasion to be convinced of the incalculable efficacy of such distinctions in keeping men apart from strangers. A Mohammedan, for instance, might be kind, liberal, indulgent; but the recurrence of a meal or any eating, threw him back upon his own distinctive practices and habits, reminding him that you were an unclean person from your habits of indulgence in foods and drinks forbidden to him, and that his own purity was endangered by communication with you. Your own perception of this feeling in him is not to you less painful and discouraging to intercourse, than its existence is to him who entertains it. It is a mutual repulsion continually operating; and its effect may be estimated from the fact, that no nation, in which a distinction of meats was rigidly enforced as part of a religious system, has ever changed its religion. Oriental legislators have been generally aware of the effect of such regulations; and hence through most parts of Asia we find a religious distinction of meats in very active operation, and so arranged as to prevent social intercourse with people of a different faith. In the chapter before us it is not difficult to discover, that the Israelites, in attending to its injunctions, must be precluded from social intercourse with any of their neighbors. As to the Egyptians, they had themselves a system of national laws on this point, which restrained them from intercourse with strangers. They could not eat with the Israelites, even in the time of Jacob. Some of the animals which the Israelites were allowed to eat, the cow, for instance, were never slaughtered by the Egyptians, being sacred to some god; while, on the other hand, the Israelites were interdicted some animals which the Egyptians ate freely. Then as to the Canaanites or Phœnicians, they seem to have eaten not only those meats prohibited by Moses, which we usually eat, but also others, of which the flesh of dogs was one. With regard to the Arabs, they were nearly related to the Israelites, and their practices were less corrupt than those of the Egyptians and Canaanites, whence the difference of food is not so strongly marked; but still it was quite enough to hinder the intimacy of the two nations. The camel not only constitutes the principal wealth of the Arabs, but its flesh is a principal animal food; besides which they eat the hare, and the *jerboa*—all these are forbidden in this chapter, the last under the name of 'mouse.' If even at this distance of time we can discover such differences between the diet of the Hebrews and that of their neighbors, we may easily conceive that a more intimate acquaintance with the diet of the latter would exhibit more important and numerous distinctions.'

Subordinate to the above was another end to be answered by the prohibition of the unclean class of animals, viz., *the furnishing of the covenant people with a code of wholesome dietetics.* Not, however, that this reason holds in regard to *all* the prohibitions relative to unclean beasts; for it cannot be questioned that among the animals denominated unclean, there were many which might safely and salubriously be used for food, and which are so used by different people at the present day. It is also to be observed that diet connects itself with climate, temperament, and general habit, in such a manner, that what is innocent or salutary in one region, or one state of society, would be decidedly noxious in another. Yet that dietetical considerations did actually enter into the reasons of these appointments, is the unanimous opinion of the ancient Jews, and is a point which Maimonides especially labors to prove. (Mor. Nevoch. p. 3, ch. 48.) There can be no question, at any rate, that we are thus to account for the prohibition

of swine's flesh. It has long been conceded that the use of this food favors the spread of cutaneous diseases, particularly where any circumstances of predisposition from climate or temperament exist. So also there is good reason to believe that the use of pork tended to produce the leprosy, a disease which is presently to come before us in a different connexion, and which was of so shocking a nature, that too severe precautions could not well be taken to prevent it. Indeed, we think it would be found, on a thorough investigation, that the nutriment afforded by the flesh of the interdicted animals in general was less wholesome, and more favorable to the production of scrofulous and scorbutic disorders, than that of almost any included in the list of permitted meats. That the Divine Legislator should have regard to the well-being of his people in this respect, and should enact such laws as would tend to guard them from the inroads of epidemic and contagious disease, will appear reasonable to the slightest reflection, especially when we consider that his care extended, in other matters, to the minutest points that related to their personal safety and comfort; as, for instance, to the articles of their apparel and the style of their building. Nor is it to be forgotten that the situation of the people under the Levitical code created a peculiar exigency in this respect. Through the whole period of their wanderings in the wilderness, the encampment was very much in the condition of a crowded garrison, and the breaking out of a violent epidemic among them would have been equally easy and destructive. Every tendency, therefore, to such an occurrence was to be guarded against with the most vigilant care. And even when settled in Canaan, the Jews were still to be a very compact population, inhabiting a territory small in proportion to their numbers, and therefore equally needing a rigid health police as a security against the ravages of fatal epidemics among them.

In addition to the above considerations, some have been disposed to recognize another, in the alleged fact that the eating of certain animals exercises a specific influence on the moral temperament; as if, for instance, the use of camels' flesh—an animal said to be of a revengeful temper—tended to impart a *vindictive* propensity to the eater, and of that of the swine to render one gross and sensual. But of this fact there is too little positive proof to make it of much account in this connexion. That such an influence may be exerted to a certain degree, and in certain forms, need not perhaps be denied; but is probably too slight to come within the range of reasons which dictated the present discriminations.

But in seeking for the designs of Infinite Wisdom in the regulations before us, we do not feel restrained from taking into view certain *moral* and *typical* considerations which we doubt not weighed, in their measure, with the Most High in the establishment of these distinctions. It is a remark of Ainsworth, that 'by *beasts* are spiritually signified *peoples* of sundry sorts; and by *eating* or *not eating*, is meant communion with or abstaining from them, as by the vision showed unto Peter the Holy Ghost expounded this law.' In this vision, it will be recollected, the apostle saw a great white sheet let down to the earth, containing all manner of four-footed beasts, creeping things, and fowls of the air, and heard at the same time a voice commanding him, notwithstanding his scruples, to rise, kill, and eat, for that that which God had cleansed was no longer to be accounted common or unclean. Immediately after this supernatural exhibition, the apostle went, under the direction of the Spirit, to the house of Cornelius, a devout Roman, whom God had chosen into that Christian church, of which the visionary sheet was a figure, from its

comprehending people of all nations, gathered from the four winds or quarters of the earth, and symbolically inclosed in white linen, to signify the Christian purity and rectitude. Having entered the house of Cornelius, he observed to those present, 'Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company or to come unto one of another nation; but God hath showed me that I should not call *any man common or unclean*.' Here we have an apostolical comment upon the purport of this vision. God had showed him that he should call no living creatures unclean; but by these beasts of all kinds he understands *men* of all nations—and in this his interpretation no doubt accorded with the drift of the Holy Spirit in prompting the vision. We are conducted then at once to the inference, if the liberty was now granted to Peter of feeding upon the flesh of unclean animals, as the sign of a newly opened intercourse between the Jews and the Gentiles, that it was the original intention of the contrary prohibition to forbid the Hebrews holding fellowship with heathen and idolaters. For a permission in one of these cases would not imply a permission in the other, unless it had been well understood that a restraint in the one had always implied a restraint in the other. To say that animals formerly prohibited as unclean might now be eaten, was in effect to say that the heathen might now be safely conversed with and preached to. Consequently the contrary injunction, that these creatures should *not* be eaten, was equivalent to a verbal command that the people of God should abstain from all familiar intercourse with the heathen world.

All this is doubtless very obvious. Under the Jewish economy this rigid interdict of fellowship with the Gentiles obtained. Under the gospel dispensation it is done away; and accordingly, when this event is predicted by Isaiah, he represents it under the image of a preternatural reconciliation between the *clean* and the *unclean* species of animals. Is. 11. 6–9, 'The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.'

But why are certain animals selected as fitting types of heathen tribes, and accordingly denominated *unclean*? Nothing is more certain than that the uncleanness attributed to brute creatures is not actual and inherent; for they innocently follow their several instincts—the wolf when it devours the lamb, and the swine when it wallows in the mire. The instinct of the wolf is not cruelty, but appetite; and the foulness of the swine is as blameless as the scent of the dunghill. Yet on these very accounts they serve as striking symbols of bad men, who by imitating the vicious or loathsome propensities of certain brutes, sink themselves from the dignity of men and Christians, to a level with 'the beasts that perish.' We see, then, an intrinsic aptitude in certain animals to shadow forth certain classes of men; and if the unclean beasts represented thus symbolically the depraved Gentiles, the clean ones, on the same principle, would stand as the appropriate type of the upright and obedient Israelites; and hence the peculiar pertinency and force of our Savior's direction to his disciples, 'Go not into the way of the *Gentiles*, but go rather to the lost *sheep* of the house of Israel.'

But let us descend to a closer survey

of the particulars of this institution, and see what animals are assigned to the respective classes, and how their qualities, symbolically understood, correspond with the character of the different persons whom they are intended to represent. The chapter before us presents on the good and peaceable side, amongst the clean creatures, the ox, the sheep, the goat, the lamb; all fishes with fins and scales, and of the fowls, the dove, the pigeon, the lark, &c., whose habits are agreeable, and their flesh grateful. On the other side we find arrayed the dog, the swine, the wolf, the fox, the lion, the tiger; of birds, the vulture, the kite, the raven, the owl, the bat; of reptiles, the whole serpent tribe, with the eel and the water-snake; and finally all insects and worms, and the various species of testacea.

In regard to all these, and many other creatures of kindred species, it is evident, upon the bare recital, that their properties and instincts render them most striking representatives of the several classes of men intended to be set forth by them; and yet we have in the outset of this chapter a still more compendious mode of distinguishing the quadrupeds, by certain external characteristics, strikingly indicative of their internal natures and dispositions. Here we see that those only were admitted into the clean class of animals which *divide the hoof and chew the cud*. Creatures of this class, it is well known, are generally marked by a harmless and tractable disposition, besides being of the utmost service to man for domestic purposes; and it might be sufficient to insist upon these properties alone as a ground for the distinction in their favor. But we see no reason to doubt that the distinguishing traits of these animals are expressive also of the *moral endowments* which are prominent in the subjects represented. Certain it is, that an animal with a cloven hoof is more inoffensive with its feet than the several tribes of wild beasts whose paws are armed with sharp claws to seize their prey, or than the horse, whose feet are such formidable weapons of offence; or the dog, who, though not armed with claws, like the bear or tiger, is yet furnished with feet of great swiftness, fitting him to pursue and destroy such creatures as are gentle and defenceless.

Again, another peculiar characteristic of clean beasts, is that of *chewing the cud*—a faculty so expressive of that act of the mind by which it revolves, meditates, and reasons upon what it receives within it, that the word *ruminate*, from *rumen, the stomach*, distinctive of this class of animals, has become an established metaphorical term in our language, by which to express the act of the mind *in studious meditation or pondering*. An animal thus employed has remarkably an air of abstraction in its countenance, as if engaged in some deep meditation; so that we cannot well conceive of a more fitting symbol of that attribute of a good man which disposes him to the devout contemplation of sacred things, and which the Psalmist so graphically portrays, Ps. 1. 2, 'His delight is in the law of the Lord, and *in his law doth he meditate day and night*.' The word of God is the true pabulum of the pious soul; and when John in vision took the little prophetical book from the angel's hand, and ate it, we see by the effects produced, that the profound study of its contents, as laden with announcements of woe, could embitter to the stomach what was exquisitely grateful to the palate; thus teaching us that the pleasure of *knowing* is sometimes counterbalanced by the pain of the *things known*.

It would doubtless be easy to extend the application of these remarks to the several orders of terrestrial, aerial, and aquatic creatures which come into the enumeration before us; but as our preface to the present chapter has

CHAPTER XI.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses and to Aaron, saying unto them,

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, [a] These *are* the beasts which ye shall eat among all the beasts that *are* on the earth.

3 Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is cloven-footed, *and* cheweth the cud among the beasts, that shall ye eat.

[a] Deut. 14. 4. Acts 10. 12, 14.

already far exceeded our usual limits, we content ourselves with what has already been offered. The illustrations given afford but another evidence of the consummate wisdom and benignity which shine through the appointments of the Levitical code.

The Distinction of Clean and Unclean Animals.

1. *The Lord spake unto Moses and to Aaron.* As joint representatives of the magisterial and priestly power. The cognizance of the following injunctions belonged to both. The Priest was to direct the people where any doubt occurred as to things forbidden or allowed, and the Magistrate was to see that the direction was followed. Comp. Num. 9. 6; 2 Chron. 29. 5,—30. 18, Ezek. 44. 23.

2, 3. *These are the beasts which ye shall eat among all the beasts,* &c. The Heb. has here two distinct words for 'beasts,' חיה *'hayâh*, and בהמה *behëmah*, a distinction which is wholly lost sight of in our version, and the same is the case in the Septuagint. The first properly implies *living creatures* in general, whether beasts, fishes, fowls, or creeping things; the second denotes *quadrupeds* only, especially those of the domestic kind, usually denominated *cattle.*——¶ *Whatsoever parteth the hoof,* &c. The first grand rule of distinction lajd down has respect to quadrupeds, and is this—that *all beasts that have their feet completely cloven, above as well as below, and at the same time chew the cud, were to be accounted clean.* Those which had neither, or indeed were wanting in one of these distinguishing marks, were to be held *unclean.* The parting of the hoof, however, in order to bring them within the specified class, must be perfect, as is intimated by the additional epithet 'cloven-footed,' or as the Heb. has it, 'that cleaveth asunder (i. e. entirely asunder) the cleft of the hoofs.' A division of hoof contrary to that which is here required is to be seen in the foot of the dog, the cat, and the lion, where, though there are several distinct toes or claws on the upper side, yet they are united by a membrane on the lower side. The parting, therefore, is not perfect. Whereas in the foot of the ox, the sheep, and the goat, the cleaving extends quite through the foot, and as far below as above. Animals of hoofs wholly solid, and unparted, as the horse, were of course unclean.——¶ *Cheweth the cud.* Heb. מעלת גרה *maălath gërah, making the cud to ascend.* That is, such animals as *bring up again* the cud from the stomach to the mouth, to be more thoroughly masticated, as is the case with the ox, and the other ruminating animals. The original word, גרה *gërah*, comes from a root signifying *to draw*, from the chewed mass being *again drawn up* into the mouth to be remasticated; and the Gr. μηρυκισμος is equivalent, being derived from μηρυω, *to revolve, to turn, to toss over*, expressive of the action of the animal's organs upon the cud. Indeed, the word 'ruminate' is derived from *rumen*, the name of the first stomach in the ox or camel, into which the food is first received, and thence cast up into the mouth. The word 'cud' is supposed to be derived either from the Cambro-British *chuyd, a vomit*, as it is the ball of food *vomited* or *thrown up* into the mouth from the stomach; or a

4 Nevertheless, these shall ye not eat, of them that chew the cud, or of them that divide the hoof: *as* the camel, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he *is* unclean unto you.

5 And the coney, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he *is* unclean unto you.

---

contraction of *chewed*, from the verb *to chew*.—'The reader will not fail to observe, that the beautifully simple and scientific division of quadrupeds here stated on divine authority at so early a period, is one which has never yet, after all the improvements in natural history, become obsolete; but, on the contrary, is one which the greatest masters of the science have continued to consider useful. Michaelis says this is 'wonderful.' But it is not wonderful when we recollect who was its author—not Moses, but God. It would have been wonderful if, as Michaelis seems to think, it evinced the progress which men had then made in the science of natural history; but it is in fact very doubtful whether the Israelites, or even Moses himself, understood the principles on which the distinction was established. After stating the general principle, a few examples are given to illustrate its application.'—*Pict. Bib.*

4. *Nevertheless these shall ye not eat*, &c. Having stated the general principle, the writer goes on to illustrate its application. When either of the specified conditions were wanting, whether in whole or in part, viz., if a beast chewed the cud, but had not its hoof perfectly parted in two, as the camel, the coney, and the hare, or if its hoof were parted, and yet it did not chew the cud, as the swine; then they were positively interdicted, and the touching their dead carcasses caused such a defilement as legally disqualified one from engaging in the worship of the tabernacle till he were ceremonially cleansed. But in the case of certain quadrupeds, a doubt might arise whether they *do* fully divide the hoof or ruminate. Whether the hare, for example, ruminates, is a point not easily settled; and so while the camel ruminates, the requisite parting of the hoof might be a matter subject to considerable doubt. In point of fact, the foot of the camel is divided into two toes, and the division below is complete, so that the animal might be accounted clean; but then it does not extend the whole length of the foot, but only to the fore part; for behind it is not parted, and we find besides under it, and connected with it, a kind of cushion or elastic pad, on which the camel goes. Now in this dubious state of circumstances, Moses authoritatively decides that the camel has *not* the hoof fully divided; and so of the other animals mentioned in the sequel. The accompanying figure will give a tolerably correct idea of the form of this animal's foot.

The Camel's Foot.

5 *The coney.* Heb. השפן *hashshaphan*. In reference to this animal we give the note of Mr. Kitto on Prov. 30. 26, 'The *conies* are but a feeble folk, yet make they their houses in the rocks.'—'It is on the sole authority of the

6 And the hare, because he chew-
eth the cud, but divideth not the
hoof; he *is* unclean unto you.

Rabbinical writers that the Heb. שפן *shaphan* has been identified with the coney, or rabbit. That this conclusion cannot be correct is very evident. The rabbit is not an Asiatic animal, and it is very far from being solicitous of a rocky habitation, which is the distinguishing characteristic by which the *shaphan* is here mentioned. Some therefore, who reject this explanation, suppose the *Jerboa* to be intended; and this opinion has the sanction of Bochart, probably from his being unacquainted with the *Daman*, or *Hyrax Syriacus*, which corresponds far better than any other animal that has been found to the brief intimations which the Scriptures convey. *Daman* is the Syrian name of the animal: the Arabs call it *Nabr*, and the Abyssinians *Ashkoko*. The same species is found in Lebanon, among the mountains and rocks of Syria and Palestine, in those of Arabia and Abyssinia, and probably extends to Southern Africa. Under its Abyssinian name of Ashkoko, a very full description of the animal has been given by Bruce, and the general accuracy of his account has been attested by more recent observations. He strongly advocates its identity with the *shaphan*; and shows how inapplicable the Scriptural intimations are to the rabbit. Its size corresponds nearly to that of the hare; and its general color is gray mixed with a reddish brown, but white under the belly, and blackish about the fore feet. It is so much an animal of the rock, that Bruce says he never saw one upon the ground, or from among the large stones at the mouth of the caves, holes, and clefts of the rock, in which it resides. They are gregarious animals, living in families; they appear to subsist on grain, fruits, and roots; and certainly chew the cud, as the *shaphan* is said to do in Levit. 11. 5. Bruce says that they do not appear to have any cry; and adds, that they do not stand upright in walking, but seem to steal along, as in fear, with the belly near the ground, advancing a few steps at a time, and then pausing. 'They have something very mild, feeble-like, and timid in their deportment; are gentle and easily tamed, though when roughly handled at first, they will bite.' Possibly it is to this that Agur refers in calling them 'a feeble folk:' although perhaps this may rather allude to their feet, which are described as being soft and tender, very liable to be hurt and excoriated, and which do not enable the animal to dig its own habitation, as the rabbit does; and in this sense, the text would mean that the *shaphan*, being disqualified by the feebleness of its feet from scooping out its own habitation in the plain, has the sagacity to seek in the mountain, habitations ready formed or completed with ease, notwithstanding that the sharp asperities of the rocks among which it is thus led to dwell, might be supposed hurtful to its feet. However this be explained, it is certain that they are called 'exceeding wise,' with reference to their choice of habitations peculiarly suited to their condition: and they might be particularly mentioned in this view from the fact that animals of the class to which they belong, are usually inhabitants of the plains. The flesh of the *shaphan* was forbidden to the Hebrews; and, in like manner, the Mohammedans and Christians of the East equally abstain from the flesh of the *daman*. Cuvier has some interesting observations, showing the resemblance, on a small scale, of this animal's skeleton to that of the rhinoceros; and says there is no animal which more clearly proves the necessity of anatomy for determining the true conformities of animals.'—*Pict. Bib.*

6. *The hare.* Heb. ארנבת *arnebeth*, supposed to be compounded of ארח *arâh, to crop*, and נרב *nib, the produce*

7 And the swine, though he divide the hoof, and be cloven-footed, yet he cheweth not the cud; [c] he *is* unclean to you.

[c] Isai. 65. 4, and 66. 3, 17.

of the ground. 'The propriety of this denomination will appear from the devastations which in various times and countries hares are recorded to have committed. The reason given for their rejection is, that, though they chew the cud, they do not divide the hoof—that is, that their foot has too many divisions—an undivided hoof and a foot with more than a complete division into two parts being equally rejected. The statement that the hare does chew the cud has been disputed by naturalists. Michaelis, who says that no two sportsmen concur in giving the same answer on the subject, considers it one of those doubtful cases, which, as in the case of the camel's foot, the legislator was obliged to decide authoritatively. But the poet Cowper, who domesticated three tame hares, and studied their habits with great attention, affirms that 'they chewed the cud all day till evening,' thus confirming the decision of the Hebrew legislator. The use of the hare for food is not forbidden to Mohammedans in their Koran, and is distinctly allowed, by the example of Mohammed himself, in the 'Mischat-ul-Masabih,' but the Moslem doctors have classed its flesh among meats which, although not legally forbidden, are abominable. Dr. Russell, who does not seem to be aware of this fact, in his 'Natural History of Aleppo,' attributes the abstinence of the Turks from the hare merely to dislike. It is however remarkable, that the Bedouin Arabs, the Eelauts of Persia, and other Mohammedan nomades, who in general pay little attention to religion, pursue hares with great eagerness, and eat them openly without the least scruple. The animals are found in considerable numbers in the deserts of Western Asia, which these nomades inhabit, or through which they frequently pass. They are usually dressed entire, without any preparation; being baked in a hole dug in the ground for the purpose: and thus cooked are relished by all nomades.'—*Pict. Bib.*

7. *The swine.* Heb. חזיר *'hazir.* 'The prohibition of the hog is by no means peculiar to the Hebrews. All their neighbors, the Egyptians, the Arabs, and the Phœnicians, concurred in disliking the hog, and interdicting its use The principal reason for the prohibition was probably dietetical. It was a remark made by the ancient physicians, and confirmed by the modern, that persons who indulged in pork were peculiarly liable to leprosy and other cutaneous disorders. Michaelis observes on this subject, 'Whoever is afflicted with any cutaneous diseases must carefully abstain from swine's flesh if he wishes to recover. It has likewise been long ago observed, that the eating of swine's flesh produces a peculiar susceptibility of itchy disorders. Now, in the whole tract of country in which Palestine lies, something more to the south, and something more to the north, the leprosy is an endemic disease: in Egypt it is peculiarly common, and the Israelites left that country so far infected with it, that Moses was obliged to make many regulations on the subject, that the contagion might be weakened, and the people tolerably guarded against its influence.' He adds, 'every physician will interdict a person laboring under any cutaneous disease from eating pork; and it has been remarked in Germany, that such diseases are in a peculiar manner to be met with in those places where a great deal of pork is eaten.' Michaelis also observes, that, although pork was forbidden as food, the Hebrews were not forbidden to keep swine as articles of trade. We agree that they *might* do so, but that they actually did

8 Of their flesh shall ye not eat, and their carcass shall ye not touch; [d] they *are* unclean to you.

9 ¶ [e] These shall ye eat, of all that *are* in the waters: whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers, them shall ye eat.

10 And all that have not fins nor scales in the seas, and in the rivers, of all that move in the waters, and of any living thing which *is* in the waters, they *shall be* an [f] abomination unto you:

11 They shall be even an abomination unto you: ye shall not eat of their flesh, but ye shall have their carcasses in abomination.

12 Whatsoever hath no fins nor scales in the waters, that *shall be* an abomination unto you.

13 ¶ [g] And these *are they which* ye shall have in abomination among the fowls; they shall not be eaten,

[d] Isai. 52. 11. See Matt. 15. 11, 20. Mark 7. 2, 15, 18. Acts 10. 14, 15, and 15. 29. Rom. 14. 14, 17. 1 Cor. 8. 8. Col. 2. 16, 21. Heb. 9. 10. [e] Deut. 14. 9.

[f] ch. 7. 18. Deut. 14. 3. [g] Deut. 14. 12.

is not very likely, when the neighboring nations were equally averse to pork with themselves. But we think the extent of this aversion has been exaggerated. The Mohammedans detest the hog quite as much as it was possible for the Jews to do, and none are kept for any purpose by them; but if they encounter a wild hog, they will capture it alive or dead, and carry it, even in their arms, to Christians, either for sale, or as an acceptable present. The only pork we ever tasted, while residing in Mohammedan Asia, was procured in this manner from Moslems. There is nothing in the law to prevent the Jews from doing the same, if they knew persons by whom pork might be eaten. It is true, that if they touched an animal not allowed for food, they became unclean till the evening; but this was equally the case if they touched a human corpse, or even the carcass of an animal fit for food, unless it had been slaughtered in the usual way. There was nothing to prevent them from handling hogs or any other unclean animals while alive.'—*Pict. Bib.*

Distinction of Fishes.

9—12. *These shall ye eat, of all that are in the waters.* In these verses the sacred writer lays down the distinction that was to be made in regard to fishes. All that have scales and fins were to be accounted clean, and all others unclean —a distinction equally clear, simple, and systematic. Even to this day fish with fins and scales are generally regarded as wholesome and often delicious, while others that differ in these particulars are looked upon with disgust, and occasionally with horror, under a belief that they are sometimes poisonous. It is interesting to remark how the sentiments of mankind do generally, in this matter, coincide with the divine precept.

Distinction of Fowls.

13. *These are they which ye shall have in abomination among the fowls.* Heb. מִן הָעוֹף *min hâoph, of the fowl*, collect. singular. The ordinance respecting birds differs from the others in the absence of any particular distinction of clean and unclean. It merely specifies, for the sake of prohibiting, certain species of known birds, leaving it to be understood that all others were allowed. But even in regard to the permitted species, it is now so difficult to ascertain them, that we cannot resist the inference that the Law itself must be considered as abrogated; for there is probably not a Jew in existence who is able to identify the different classes here mentioned. And the same remark holds good in respect to many of the animals and insects designated in this chapter. They must find themselves therefore in the predicament of

they *are* an abomination: the eagle, and the ossifrage, and the ospray,

14 And the vulture, and the kite after his kind;

being bound to abstain from eating the flesh and coming in contact with the carcasses of various orders of animals and birds, and yet perfectly ignorant what they are, and not knowing but they are continually breaking the law every day!——¶ *The eagle.* Heb. נשר *nĕsher*, from the obsolete root נשר *nâshar*, *to lacerate, to tear in pieces*, as the eagle with its talons and beak. The Heb. term, however, has a broader acceptation, and comprehends also a species of *vulture*, especially in those passages where the נשר *nĕsher* is said to be bald, Mic. 1. 16, and to feed on carcasses, Job. 39. 27, Prov. 30. 17 (Comp. *αετος*, Mat. 24. 28.) As the character and habits of the eagle, the king of birds, may be learned in detail from the common works on natural history, the reader is referred to them for all the further information he may desire. Comp. Note on Deut. 32. 11.——¶ *The ossifrage.* Heb. פרס *pĕres*, from פרס *pâras*, *to crush*, or *break*, equivalent to which is 'ossifrage,' *bone-breaker*, in our version, from the Lat 'os,' *bone*, and 'frango,' *to break*. This is one of the most difficult to be identified of all the birds in the list. The Targum of Onkelos, and the Sept. and Vulg. versions read it 'vulture,' in which the majority of versions concur. Others think it denotes the 'black eagle,' and some the 'falcon.' Mr. Kitto decides in favor of the 'great sea-eagle,' a bird about the size of the golden eagle, and inhabiting the cliffs and promontories along the sea-shore. It is spread over the northern parts of Europe and Asia.——¶ *The ospray.* Heb. עזניה *oz-niyyâh*. The ospray, or fish-hawk (*Pandion haliæëtus*,) is a native of both continents. The upper parts of its body are of a rich glossy brown; the tail barred with brown of different shades, while the under parts are white. It subsists entirely upon fish, which it seizes by darting down with incredible velocity upon them. Some think the black eagle is here intended; but the probabilities are at least equally in favor of our version.

14. *The vulture.* Heb. דאה *dâăh*, with the import of *flying*, or rather of *sailing with expanded wings* through the air, and in Deut. 14. 13, ראה *râăh*, with that of *seeing;* but whether from its remarkable powers of vision, or by an easy interchange of the similar letters ד *d* and ר *r*, is uncertain. The Chal. here follows the Heb. giving דיתא *daitha*, but in Deut. 14. 13, it renders by בת כנפא *bath kanpha*, *daughter of the wing*. The Gr. renders it by *γυψ*, and the Lat. Vulg. by 'Milvus,' *a kite*, which, from its signification when used as a verb, seems to be very appropriate. This verb, when taken in its full application, denotes that kind of flight which is at once swift, varied, and majestic. Hence the term agrees well with the kite, or glede, which is characterized by the easy and sweeping motion with which it glides through the air. The kite (*Milvus ictinus*), though it preys upon the lesser animals, does not scruple to feed upon garbage, and therefore, in Egypt, it is often seen in company with the vultures when at their necessary and useful task of devouring the carrion and offal of meat, that they may not pollute the air by decomposition.——¶ *The kite.* Heb. איה *ayyah*, rendered in Job, 28. 7, 'vulture,' and that very properly. 'This is a splendid bird, diffused over the south of Europe, Turkey, Persia, and Africa. It feeds on putrid flesh, like the rest of the family; and makes its nest in the clefts of the rock, from whence it can survey the distant plains, and mark the fallen prey. In length it is about three feet six inches, with an expanse of wings reaching to eight or nine. The color of the full-grown bird is a deep rufous gray, be-

15 Every raven after his kind;
16 And the owl, and the night-hawk, and the cuckoo, and the hawk after his kind,

coming black on the quill-feathers and tail. The head and neck are not entirely bare, but are covered with a short close down, and the beautiful ruff is of a pure white. Travelers, astonished at the extraordinary distance from which these birds can descry a carcass, have debated whether they were guided by sight or by scent; but the beautiful and picturesque accuracy of the Book of Job, on many points of natural history, seem here to afford us its high authority in ascribing it to the eye.'—*Pict. Bib.*——¶ *After his kind.* This expression is doubtless used here for the purpose of including whatever different varieties there may chance to be under the same species. And so in the subsequent verses.

15. *The raven.* Heb. ערב *oreb*, which, from its etymology, we might translate 'the bird of night,' an appellation which it owed to the tincture of its plumage, which was dark, like the livery of night, or ערב *ereb*. A word of the same origin is extended by the Arabian writers to the rook, crow, and jackdaw, as well as to the raven: in fact it seems to include all those species which are by Cuvier ranged under the genus *Corvus*. The predominant color of these is black, hence *Ereb* (the origin of the classic *Erebus*), implying a sable hue, is a very proper word as a generic appellation corresponding to *Corvus*.

16. *The owl.* Heb. בת היענה *bath hayyonah, daughter of the yonah.* This bird is generally agreed to be the 'ostrich,' and to be so called from *vociferation*, or the screeching, mournful noise which it makes, and which is implied in the original word יענה *yonah*. The comparatively little knowledge of natural history enjoyed by the translators, must account for their rendering it 'owl.'——¶ *The night-hawk.* Heb. תחמס *tahmâs*, from a root implying *rapine* and *violence*. It was in all probability a species of owl (Lat. Vulg. 'noctua,') so called from its ravenous and predatory habits. Its scientific designation is the 'Strix Orientalis,' thus described by Hasselquist: 'It is of the size of the common owl, and lodges in the large buildings or ruins of Egypt and Syria, and sometimes even in the dwelling-houses. The Arabs in Egypt call it 'Masasa,' and the Syrians 'Bana.' It is extremely voracious in Syria, to such a degree that if the windows be left open in the evenings, it flies into the houses, and even kills infants, unless they are carefully watched; wherefore the women are much afraid of him.——¶ *The cuckoo.* Heb. שחף *sha'haph*. As the Greek version renders this term by λαρον, and the Vulgate by *larus*, we are led to suppose that some of the lesser kinds of sea-fowl are meant; and from the nature of the original word, which denotes *slenderness* and *wasting*, one would feel inclined to think that the terns must be here alluded to. The terns (*Sterna*) are slender birds, and resemble, with their long wings and forked tail, the common swallow; whence they are called, in French and English, 'sea-swallows.' Some writers think the sea-mew is intended; but Dr. Shaw inclines to the *saf-saf*—the name of which is not unlike the Hebrew of the text. This is a graminivorous and gregarious bird; of which there are two species described by the Doctor in his 'Travels,' p. 252.——¶ *The hawk.* Heb. נץ *nëtz*, from נצא=נצה *nâtzâh, to fly*, supposed to be the common *sparrow-hawk*, which abounds over the old continent, and has long been noted for the celerity of its flight, and the activity with which it pursues its prey.

17. *The little owl.* Heb. כוס *kōs*, Gr. νυκτικοραξ. This was perhaps the common *barn-owl*, well known in nearly all countries. Our version gives three

17 And the little owl, and the cormorant, and the great owl,

18 And the swan, and the pelican, and the gier-eagle,

owls in two verses; but this appears to be the only real one. Some writers, however, think that the list of water-fowl begins here, and that the *sea-gull* is intended.——¶ *The Cormorant.* Heb. שלך *shalak*, from a root signifying *to throw, cast, or dart down*, and thence well applied to birds which *dart down* with great velocity upon their prey. Hence the Gr. καταρρακτης, *the cataract*, or the bird which *precipitates* itself upon its prey. Chal. שלנונא *shalenona, fish-hunter.*——¶ *The great owl.* Heb. ינשוף *yansuph*, Gr. ιβις. The sacred *Ibis*, so celebrated in ancient story, seems to be the bird intended—the *Ibis religiosa* of Cuvier. This bird was embalmed by the Egyptians; and specimens have been preserved in a state of such perfection that not only the skeleton but the feathers might be studied, in order to ascertain its identity with the living animal. It is about the size of a common fowl. While young, the neck is partially covered with down, or minute feathers, which fall off when the plumage is complete. The major part of its feathers are of a clear and spotless white. The head, bill, neck, and legs are of a deep black; as are also the tips of the quill-feathers, with a violet reflection. The last four secondaries are of the same tincture, and by their length and silky nature form an elegant plume, mantling over the hinder parts of the body.

18. *The swan.* Heb. תנשמת *tinshemeth.* The Sept. renders this by πορφυριωνα, *the purple bird*, a bird very famous among the ancients for the beauty of its plumage, which is indigo mingled with red. It inhabits marshy situations in the neighborhood of rivers and lakes, and is found universally in the Levant and the islands of the Mediterranean. Michaelis, with whom Parkhurst is disposed to concur, thinks the goose is intended; and hence infers that the modern Jews transgress their law in using *goose-fat*, in lieu of other fat or of butter, in their culinary preparations.——¶ *The pelican.* Heb. קאת *kaath.* As the root קאה *kââh* signifies *to vomit*, the name is supposed very probably to designate the 'pelican,' which receives its food into the *pouch*, under the lower mandible or jaw, and by pressing it on its breast with its bill, *throws it up* for the nourishment of its young. Hence the fable which represents the pelican as wounding her breast with her bill, that she may feed her young with her own blood; a fiction which has no foundation but in the above circumstance.—'We have often seen one of the species sitting on the ledge of a rock, a foot or two above the surface of the water, in pensive silence during the whole day; the continuity of its proceeding being only interrupted at distant intervals by the near approach of some unlucky fish, upon which it darted with unerring certainty, and then resumed its wonted stillness. At other times we have observed them urging their way, with rapid flight, thirty or forty miles into the country, after a day's fishing, to feast in the lonely wilderness upon the contents of their well-stored pouches: and were then reminded of the words, 'I am like a pelican in the wilderness.'—*Pict. Bib.*——¶ *The gier-eagle.* Heb. רחם *ra'ham.* By this term the Sept. understands the κυκνος, *the swan;* but as the root signifies *tenderness* and *affection*, it is obviously intended to point out some bird noted for its attachment to its young. This applies very well to the 'swan,' which, notwithstanding its meek and inoffensive disposition will, in defence of its young, give battle to the larger animals, and even to man himself.

19. *The stork.* Heb. חסידה *'hasidah*, from חסד *'hasad*, which signifies *to be full, abundant, exuberant in goodness*,

19 And the stork, the heron after her kind, and the lapwing, and the bat.

kindness, affection.—'The bird is an inhabitant of the warmer regions, but often migrates to higher latitudes to lay its eggs and hatch its young. It is particularly abundant in Egypt and the western parts of Asia, and is also well known in different parts of Europe; and, wherever found, its amiable and confiding disposition has secured it the protection and esteem of man. No bird is more famous for its attachment to its young; and, which is more rare among birds, for its kindness to the old and feeble of its own race. It has also acquired a sort of sanctity in different countries, not less perhaps from its grave and contemplative appearance than for its predilection for churches, mosques, and temples, on the roofs or towers of which—perhaps because they are in general the loftiest buildings—it usually prefers to establish its large and well-compacted nest. It also builds on the roofs of private houses; and, in the East, on the wind-chimneys by which apartments are ventilated. This habit brings it into close connexion with man in Turkey and Persia; in most parts of which countries people sleep at night on the flat roofs of their houses, and sometimes sit and amuse themselves there in the cool of the evening. The storks, although then full in view, and themselves observant of all that passes, do not on any occasion exhibit alarm or apprehension. This may as well be a consequence as a cause of the peculiar favor with which they are regarded. But certain it is, that in Turkey, Persia, Egypt, or indeed in any place, even in Europe, to which these birds resort, a man would be universally execrated who should molest a stork, or even disturb its nest during its absence. In some cases the law expressly provides for its protection. It was exactly the same among ancient nations, the laws in some of which made it highly penal to kill a stork. It often appeared to us as if the Orientals in general regarded the stork as a sort of household god, whose presence brought a blessing upon the house on which it established its nest. They also do not overlook the importance of its services in clearing the land of serpents and other noxious reptiles, which form part of its food. Whether the law of Moses prohibited the stork as food, in order to protect its existence, or because the nature of its food rendered it unclean, it is impossible to determine: perhaps both reasons operated.'—*P. Bib.*

——¶ *The heron.* Heb. אנפה *anâphâh.* 'This bird is only mentioned here and in Deut. 14. 18; and as in both places it is only named without the mention of any characterizing circumstance, very ample latitude has been allowed to conjecture in all attempts to determine the species. The crane, the curlew, the woodcock, the peacock, the kite, the parrot, and the mountain falcon, have had their several claims advocated. The root *anaph* signifies to breathe short through the nostrils, to snort as in anger, and hence, to be angry; and this has led to the conclusion that a bird of angry dispositions must be intended. It seems to us so hopeless to identify the bird in this way, that we have no desire to disturb the common reading which has as much and as little probability as any other. The dispositions of the heron are sufficiently irritable to satisfy those who rest upon the etymology of the name. The bird is allied to the stork, and, like it, feeds on fish and reptiles, and is noted for its voracious appetite. The heron is found in most countries: in England it was formerly held in high estimation, its flesh being counted a great delicacy, and bore a price equal to that of the pheasant and curlew. Heronhawking was also a favorite amusement of kings

20 All fowls that creep, going upon *all* four, *shall be* an abomination unto you.

21 Yet these may ye eat, of every flying creeping thing that goeth upon *all* four, which have legs above their feet, to leap withal upon the earth;

22 *Even* these of them ye may eat; [h] the locust after his kind, and the bald locust after his kind, and the beetle after his kind, and the grasshopper after his kind.

23 But all *other* flying creeping

[h] Matt. 3. 4. Mark 1. 6.

and nobles; on which account laws were enacted for the preservation of the species. A person destroying their eggs was liable to the then heavy fine of twenty shillings for each egg. These birds are gregarious in the breeding season, and make their nests very near each other. They may be tamed when taken young: the ancient Egyptians used to keep them tame—apparently to assist in fishing; and Ælian reports, that they so well understood the human voice as to become exceedingly angry when any person abused them or charged them with laziness. If this was true at the time of the exodus, the bird must have been familiarly known to the Israelites, and the probability is thus strengthened that the heron is really intended.'—*Pict. Bib.*——¶ *The lapwing.* Heb. דוכיפת *dukiphath.* Gr. *εποψ, upupa.* We may conclude this to be the *hoopoe*, which is often met with in the writings of antiquity; it is an elegant and animated bird, its head being surmounted with a beautiful crest of plumes, which by their varying motion seem to express the feelings of the wearer. It is spread over all the warmer regions of the old continent, and occasionally visits this country. It is about twelve inches long, with a fawn-colored plumage, barred with black and white on the wings and lower parts of the back. Tail black, with a crescent of white at the base. Its food consists of insects, worms, and snails, and it was perhaps on this account forbidden as an article of diet.——¶ *The bat.* Heb. עטלף *atallëph*, so called according to most lexicographers from two words implying *fliers in darkness.* As Moses begins his catalogue with the Eagle, the highest and noblest of the feathered race, so he ends with the Bat, which is the lowest, and forms the connecting link between the quadruped and volatile species.

Distinction of Insects.

20. *All fowls that creep.* That insects are here meant is plain from the following verse, and therefore the sense is, all those creatures which fly and also creep, 'going upon all four,' i. e. creeping along upon their feet in the manner of quadrupeds, such as flies, wasps, bees, &c., together with all leaping insects; these are to be avoided as unclean, with the exceptions in the two next verses.

21. *Which have legs above their feet to leap withal upon the earth.* Insects, reptiles, and worms, are generally prohibited; but a previous exception is here made in favor of those insects, which besides four walking legs, have also two longer springing legs (*pedes saltatorii*) and which, under the name of 'locusts,' are declared clean. Those particularly enumerated seem to indicate the four leading genera of the locust family, of which the domestic cricket, the mole-cricket, the green grasshopper, and the locust may be taken as representatives.

22. *The beetle.* Heb. סלעם *solâm.* As this insect is never eaten, a sort of grasshopper or locust is probably intended; as it is likely that either four species, or four different stages of the same insect, are intended by the four names in this verse. In Palestine, Arabia, and the adjoining countries, locusts

things, which have four feet, *shall be* an abomination unto you.

24 And for these ye shall be unclean: whosoever toucheth the carcass of them shall be unclean until the even.

25 And whosoever beareth *aught* of the carcass of them [i] shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even.

26 *The carcasses* of every beast which divideth the hoof and *is* not cloven-footed, nor cheweth the cud, *are* unclean unto you: every one

[i] ch. 14. 8, and 15. 5. Numb. 19. 10, 22, and 31. 24.

---

are one of the common articles of food, and the people would be very ill off if precluded from eating them. When a swarm of them desolates the fields, they prove, in some measure, themselves an antidote to the famine which they occasion; so much so, indeed, that the poor people look forward with anxiety to the arrival of a swarm of locusts, as yielding them sustenance without any trouble. 'They collect them in great quantities, not only for their own eating, but for sale in the bazaars—for these insects are highly relished by all classes of people. In some towns there are shops exclusively for the sale of locusts. They are so prepared as to be kept for use a considerable time. There are different processes; but the most usual in Western Asia is to throw them alive into a pot of boiling water, mixed with a good quantity of salt. After boiling a few minutes they are taken out, and the heads, feet, and wings being plucked off, the trunks are thoroughly dried in the sun, and then stowed away in sacks. They are usually sold in this condition, and are either eaten without further preparation, or else are broiled, or stewed, or fried in butter. They are very commonly mixed with butter, and so spread on thin cakes of bread, and thus eaten, particularly at breakfast. Europeans have usually an aversion to the eating of these insects, from being unaccustomed to them; and we must confess that we did not ourselves receive them at first without some repugnance: but, separately from the question of usage, they are not more repulsive than shrimps or prawns, to which they do, indeed, in taste and other qualities, bear a greater resemblance than to any other article of food to which we are accustomed.—The Israelites being in the peninsula of Sinai when they received this law, it is a rather remarkable fact that Burckhardt describes the present inhabitants of that peninsula as the only Bedouins known to him who do not use the locust as an article of food.'—*Pict. Bib.*

23. *Shall be an abomination to you.* A thing to be loathed and abominated as being unclean by the ceremonial law. All insects appear to be included in this prohibition except the *locustæ*. With the exception of these, few, if any, of the tribe of insects, properly so called, have ever constituted an article of human food.

Defilement from unclean Carcasses.

24. *For these ye shall be unclean.* That is, those which follow, says Ainsworth; and so Michaelis and most others understand it; confining the uncleanness to the dead bodies only of the beasts and reptiles after mentioned. Indeed if it were extended to the insect tribes mentioned v. 20–23, it would scarcely seem possible to have remained clean a single hour. But whoever ate any of the interdicted animals, or of the forbidden fowls or fishes, or came in contact with their dead carcasses, contracted thereby a legal uncleanness for that day; nor was he to be admitted to the worship of the sanctuary, nor to have intercourse with those who were, till he had purified himself by washing his clothes and his body, which he was to do forthwith.

27. *Whatsoever goeth upon his paws.*

that toucheth them shall be unclean.

27 And whatsoever goeth upon his paws, among all manner of beasts that go on *all* four, those *are* unclean unto you: whoso toucheth their carcass shall be unclean until the even.

28 And he that beareth the carcass of them shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even they *are* unclean unto you.

29 ¶ These also *shall be* unclean unto you among the creeping things that creep upon the earth; the weasel, and [k] the mouse, and the tortoise after his kind,

30 And the ferret, and the chameleon, and the lizard, and the snail, and the mole.

[k] Isai. 66. 17.

Heb. עַל כַּפָּיו *al kappauv, upon his palms;* referring to those animals whose feet have a kind of resemblance to the human hand, such as lions, bears, dogs, cats, apes, monkeys, &c.

Distinction of the creeping things.

29. *Among the creeping things that creep upon the earth.* That is, those which have legs so short that they creep, as it were, with their bellies upon the ground, as the mole, the field-mouse, and the lizard tribe.——¶ *The weasel.* Heb. חֹלֶד *'holed,* from the Syriac חלד *'halad, to creep in.* The Septuagint and the Vulgate agree in rendering this word by 'weasel,' though it is difficult to see on what grounds they should have classified the weasel among *reptiles.* The opinion of Bochart is far preferable, who understands by the חֹלֶד *'holed, the mole,* whose property of *digging into* the earth, and *burrowing under its surface* is well known.——¶ *The mouse.* Heb. עַכְבָּר *akbâr.* Gr. μυς. 'There seems good reason to suppose that the mouse of Scripture was the *Dipus sagitta* or *Jerboa,* an animal about the size of a large rat, and characterized by the disproportionate shortness of the fore-feet. Its color is a pale tawny-yellow, lighter on the under parts; the long tail is terminated by a tuft of black hair. The brevity of their fore-feet is compensated by the size and strength of the tail, by which, as in the case of the kangaroo, they are enabled to balance themselves in an upright position. The form of the head and the expansion of the ears impress them with some resemblance to the rabbit. They are very abundant in Egypt, Syria, and the north of Africa, and burrow in the sand or among ruins. Their flesh, though eaten by the natives of the East, is unsavory, and hence the interdiction, which forbade them as food, did not lay the necessity of much self-denial upon the Israelites. As this animal feeds exclusively on vegetable produce, a multiplication of its numbers could not fail to be highly injurious to cultivation.'—*Pict. Bib.*——¶ *The tortoise.* Heb. צָב *tzab.* Gr. κροκοδειλος, χερσαιος, *crocodilus.* Some member of the family of *lizards* is undoubtedly intended by this term, but the precise variety it is difficult to determine. Jarchi says it is a creature 'like a frog,' and nearer to the truth we have no means of coming.——¶ *After his kind.* Gr. τα ὁμοια αυτῳ, *things like unto it.*

30. *The ferret.* Heb. אַנָקָה *anâkâh,* from אָנַק *ânak, to groan, to cry out;* a species of lizard, deriving its name from its *piercing, doleful cry.* Such a description of this animal is found in countries bordering on the Mediterranean, of a reddish gray color, spotted with brown. It is thought at Cairo to poison the victuals over which it passes, and especially salt provisions, of which it is very fond. It has a voice somewhat resembling that of a frog, as is intimated by its Hebrew name.——¶ *The chameleon.* Heb. כֹּחַ *koa'h.* Gr. χαμαιλεων. Here again we are at a loss to identify the creature called a 'cha-

31 These *are* unclean to you among all that creep: whosoever doth touch them, when they be dead, shall be unclean until the even.

32 And upon whatsoever *any* of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether *it be* any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel *it be*, wherein *any* work is done, [1] it must be put into water, and it shall be unclean until the even; so it shall be cleansed.

[1] ch. 15. 12.

meleon;' and as we are not likely to obtain any thing more certain, we may state the opinion of Kitto, who considers it a species of lizard, found in Arabia, Nubia, and Abyssinia, remarkable for the readiness with which it forces its way into the sand when pursued—an evidence of the strength and activity implied in its Hebrew name, which signifies *force, prowess.*—¶ *The lizard.* Heb. לטאה *letâăh.* The original word signifies *to adhere*, and therefore may apply to a frightful and venomous species of lizard, well known in the East, covered with tubercles, and of a grey color. It lives in holes of the walls, and under stones, and covers itself with dirt, which is perhaps alluded to by the sense of *adhering* conveyed in the name.—¶ *The snail.* Heb. חמט *'homet.* This word in Chaldee signifies *to bow down.* It therefore suggests the *Lacerta stellio*, which is noted for bowing its head, insomuch that the followers of Mohammed kill it, because they say it mimics them in the mode of repeating their prayers. It is about a foot in length, and of an olive color shaded with black.—¶ *The mole.* Heb. תנשמת *tinsheməth*, from נשם *nâsham, to breathe.* We may therefore with much probability adopt the opinion of Bochart, and apply it to the chameleon, which has lungs of such vast dimensions, that, when filled, the body is so much dilated as to appear transparent. The varying capacity of their lungs enables them, by exposing a greater or less portion of blood to the influence of the air, to alter the tincture of the circulating fluid at pleasure, which when sent to the surface must tend to give a color more or less vivid to the skin. The chameleon, or *Lacerta Africana*, is a native of Egypt, Barbary, and of the south of Spain.

32. *Upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean.* That is, it might not be used till it was cleansed. This, however, was to hold only in regard to certain kinds of vessels specified in this verse, viz. either such as were very solid, and would not imbibe a scent so as to retain it for a long time, or such as were of great value, and could not easily be replaced. Others of a different description, such, for instance, as were very porous, or earthen vessels of little value, were to be broken to pieces, and thrown away. 'The great inconveniences which the law connected with this and other defilements, necessarily obliged the Israelites to pay great attention to cleanliness: and this was probably what the laws on this subject had principally in view. The importance of regulations on such points are not so fully appreciated in this country as in the East, where all kinds of reptiles, many of them poisonous, find their way into the most private apartments and conceal themselves in recesses, crevices, vessels, and boxes. Experience taught the writer of this note, while in the East, to observe the greatest caution in examining a box or vessel, which had not very recently been disturbed, lest a scorpion, or other noxious reptile, might be concealed within it. On this subject, Michaelis observes that this law was well calculated to prevent accidents from poisoning: 'Of

33 And every earthen vessel, whereinto *any* of them falleth, whatsoever *is* in it shall be unclean; and [m] ye shall break it.

34 Of all meat which may be eaten, *that* on which *such* water cometh shall be unclean: and all drink that may be drunk in every *such* vesssel, shall be unclean.

35 And every *thing* whereupon *any part* of their carcass falleth, shall be unclean; *whether it be* oven, or ranges for pots, they shall be broken down: *for* they *are* unclean, and shall be unclean unto you.

36 Nevertheless, a fountain or pit, *wherein there is* plenty of water, shall be clean: but that which toucheth their carcass shall be unclean.

37 And if *any part* of their carcass fall upon any sowing-seed

[m] ch. 6. 28, and 15. 12.

the poisoning of liquors by toads creeping into casks we often read; and Husselquist relates an instance where the poison of a *Gecko* in a cheese had nearly proved fatal. Mice and rats likewise sometimes poison meat that is uncovered, by means of the poison laid for themselves being vomited upon it. I remember the case of a brewing of beer, which, to all the people of a town who had drunk it, occasioned most violent agonies; and in regard to which, although it was most peremptorily denied by the magistrates and the brewers, there appeared perfectly good reason for believing that arsenic had in this manner got among the malt.'"—*P. Bib.*

34. *Of all meat which may be eaten*, &c. The meaning undoubtedly is, that any meat which might otherwise be lawfully eaten, was made unclean if water poured out of any of the vessels named above was to come upon it. For the water coming out of a defiled vessel was thereby itself defiled, and communicated defilement to the meat on which it fell. On the same principle, all drink that might be drunk from any such vessel was also unclean and defiling.

35. *Whether it be oven, or ranges for pots.* Heb. כיריים *kirayim.* By this is probably meant a kind of hearth made of stones, where fires were made for boiling their pots or kettles. The ovens, on the other hand, were the contrivances for baking bread.

36. *Nevertheless, a fountain or pit, wherein there is plenty of water, shall be clean.* Heb. מעין ובור מקוה מים *mayaun u-bōr mikvēh mayim, a fountain or a pit, a gathering of waters.* It is uncertain whether the 'gathering of waters' is intended to be understood of something distinct from the fountain or pit mentioned before, or whether it is merely exegetical of those terms. To us it seems more probable that it refers to pools, ponds, or lakes, and such like *collections* of waters. Accordingly the Gr. renders it with an interjected 'and' before 'gathering.' This will perhaps be more obvious when we consider the kind and merciful drift of the provision. This was to afford the means of the speediest possible cleansing from the pollutions which any one might have contracted. For this end they were allowed to have recourse to any collection of waters, whether in pools, cisterns, or ponds, even although an unclean carcass might have fallen into it, or an unclean person may have just washed himself in it. Considering the scarcity of water in that country, if it had not been for such an allowance as this, it might have been extremely difficult for them to have performed the requisite ablutions after their defilements.——¶ *But that which toucheth their carcass.* Rather, 'whosoever toucheth,' referring to persons who drew out the carcass, instead of the instrument employed for that purpose, as others understand it. So the Gr. ὁ απτομενος, *he that toucheth.*

37. *Fall upon any sowing-seed.* The

which is to be sown, it *shall be* clean.

38 But if *any* water be put upon the seed, and *any part* of their carcass fall thereon, it *shall be* unclean unto you.

39 And if any beast, of which ye may eat, die; he that toucheth the carcass thereof shall be unclean until the even.

40 And [n] he that eateth of the carcass of it shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even; he also that beareth the carcass of it shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even.

41 And every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth *shall be* an abomination; it shall not be eaten.

42 Whatsoever goeth upon the belly, and whatsoever goeth upon *all* four, or whatsoever hath more feet among all creeping things that creep upon the earth, them ye shall not eat; for they *are* an abomination.

43 [o] Ye shall not make yourselves abomin ble with any creeping thing that creepeth, neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby.

[n] ch. 17. 15, and 22. 8. Deut. 14. 21. Ezek. 4. 14, and 44. 31.

[o] ch. 20. 25.

same exception extended to the grain prepared for sowing. If a mouse, for instance, were found dead among a quantity of wheat, designed for sowing, it might still be used for that purpose. But other wheat, not intended for sowing, thus made unclean, might not be used, till it was cleansed by washing. In the case of the seed to be sown, it would of course pass through so many changes of state before it could become food, that the pollution might be supposed to be taken away of course.

38. *But if any water be put upon the seed.* Wet seed might be supposed to have received some tincture from the carcass which dry did not; and not being in a fit condition to be sown till it was dry, it was in the mean time to be cleansed. Others, however, suppose the allusion here is not to seed-corn, but to such as was prepared for present food; and this sense is perhaps countenanced by the original, which has 'seed' in general, instead of '*the* seed,' as in our version, which seems to restrict it to seed intended for sowing.

39. *If any beast of which ye may eat, die.* That is, which either dies of itself, or is torn by wild beasts, or is suffocated, so that the blood remains in the veins. Such meat became unlawful not only to be eaten, but to be touched; the carcasses of *unclean* animals, whether they died by disease or were killed; but those of *clean* animals had this effect only when they died of themselves.

40. *He that eateth of the carcass of it* That is, ignorantly; for if he did it knowingly and presumptuously, against the positive command, it constituted the high-handed offence against which the doom of excision, the most fearful penalty of the law, was threatened. Num. 15. 30, Deut. 14. 21.

41, 42. *Every creeping thing.* This rule is of course to be understood with the exceptions stated above, in vv. 21–24, and all creatures of the *creeping* kind that may be ranged under the three following classes; (1.) Those which move by the aid of the under part of the stomach and belly, as serpents. (2.) Those which, though they have four legs, nevertheless move like reptiles, as lizards, moles, &c. (3.) Those which move by short and almost imperceptible feet, as caterpillars, centipedes, millepedes, &c. The 42d verse seems to be merely explanatory of v. 41.

43. *Ye shall not make yourselves abominable.* Heb. אל תשקצו נפשתיכם *al teshakketzu naphthoshĕkem, ye shall not make abominable your souls.* They

44 For I *am* the LORD your God; ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and [p] ye shall be holy; for I *am* holy: neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

45 [q] For I *am* the LORD that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: [r] ye shall therefore be holy, for I *am* holy.

46 This *is* the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living creature that moveth in the waters, and of every creature that creepeth upon the earth:

47 [s] To make a difference between the unclean and the clean, and between the beast that may be eaten and the beast that may not be eaten.

p Exod. 19. 6. ch. 19. 2, and 20. 7, 26. 1 Thess. 4. 7. 1 Pet. 1. 15, 16. q Exod. 6. 7.

r ver. 44. s ch. 10. 10.

would make themselves *abominable* if they *ate* them, and *unclean* if they did but *touch* them.

44. *For I am the Lord your God, &c.* See Note on Ex. 3. 15, 18. We have here the spiritual drift of all these carnal and ceremonial ordinances; for 'meat commendeth us not to God,' nor is 'any thing unclean of itself,' nor is there 'any thing from without a man which entering in can defile him.' A grand moral purport was couched under all these legal rites, and from the declaration in these verses we cannot fail to discern what it is. As God himself is a being of infinite purity and perfection, unutterably surpassing all the false gods of the heathen, so it was his purpose that his own covenant people should be signally separated and distinguished in their mode of life from all the surrounding nations, and thus by being debarred from intercourse with them, be secured also from participation in their corruptions and idolatries.——¶ *Neither shall ye defile yourselves.* Heb. נפשתיכם *naphshothĕkem, your souls;* as in the preceding verse. On the peculiar use of this term in Hebrew, see Note on Gen. 34. 29. In this connexion it evidently has relation rather to the *body* than the *mind*, as is often the case elsewhere.

45. *I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, &c.* This was an act of favor signal and illustrious, and lying so essentially at the foundation of all other mercies towards them as a nation, that it is again and again appealed to with a view to impress a sense of their obligations on their hearts. There could not be a greater aggravation of their guilt than to be unmindful of what God had wrought for them in their deliverance by a stretched-out arm from the house of bondage.

46. *This is the law of beasts, &c* That is, this collection of laws in the present chapter constitutes that code which is to regulate the distinction of living creatures into clean and unclean, and thereby to afford you a rule by which to distinguish between the different kinds of meat which may and which may not be eaten.

47. *To make a difference between the unclean and the clean.* Heb. להבדיל *lehavdil, to separate, to divide.* It is the same word which occurs v. 10 of the preceding chapter, where the priests are commanded to be always sober, that they may be able 'to *put a difference* (להבדיל *lehavdil*) between holy and unholy, between unclean and clean,' which they were to do not only for themselves, but also for others, for 'the priest's lips should keep knowledge.' Accordingly it is said, Ezek. 44. 23, 'And they shall *teach my people the difference between the holy and profane, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean.*' And so also Jer. 15. 19, 'Therefore thus saith the Lord, If thou return, then will I bring thee again, and thou shalt stand before

me: and *if thou take forth the precious from the vile*, thou shalt be as my mouth: let them return unto thee; but return not thou unto them.' Whereas the opposite is expressively set forth, Ezek. 22. 26, 'Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they *have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean*, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them.'

General Results.—On a retrospect of this chapter, it will be seen that the legal restrictions imposed upon the Hebrews by the laws of Moses, as to animal food, were, in their general results, as follows:—

With the exception of locusts, the whole of the invertebrate classes are prohibited.

Of the vertebrate animals, the whole of the order of reptiles are prohibited.

Of the orders *mammalia* and *pisces*, i. e. quadrupeds and fishes, a classification is made, restricting the clean quadrupeds to such as parted the hoof, and were cloven-footed, and chewed the cud; and the clean fishes, to such as had fins and scales. These definitions are so precise and comprehensive, that there could not be much difficulty in determining what was excluded by them. They permitted the eating only a few of the graminivorous quadrupeds, such as oxen, sheep, and deer; and such fishes (whether from salt or fresh water) as had the clear and obvious character of fins and scales; most, if not all, of which afford a palatable and nutritious diet.

To prevent the possibility, however, of mistake, a few of the prohibited quadrupeds are specified; viz. the camel, the jerboa, (a common animal in the East) the hare, the mole, the mouse, and the bat; the ape and monkey tribe are excluded, by the apt definition of animals going upon their paws or fingers.

With respect to birds, it is singular that no general definition is given of the clean or unclean; but certain species or genera are enumerated and declared unclean, leaving it to be inferred that all the rest might be eaten.

According to the view taken above, all vultures, eagles, falcons, hawks, crows, ostriches, sea-gulls, owls, pelicans, ibises, storks, herons, and hoopoes were declared unclean. Linnæus divided the *aves* (birds) into 78 genera: not more than eleven of these are prohibited by the laws of Moses. The 67 remaining genera include among them the whole of the *anseres*, or goose and duck tribe; the whole of the *gallinæ*, or grain-eating tribe, as peacocks, pheasants, partridges, quails, and common fowls. The whole of the *passeres*, including doves, pigeons, and numerous genera of small fruit and seed-eating birds. These, and various other genera of birds, seem to have been deemed clean; from whence, perhaps, it may be inferred, that the flesh of birds was considered in that early age peculiarly wholesome and nutritious food. It is well known also, that geese, ducks, quails, pigeons, and birds of that kind, abound in Egypt and Palestine.

CHAPTER XII.

Laws relative to the Purification of Women after Child-birth.

The ordinances contained in this chapter having, like most of the code to which they belong, been abolished under the gospel, can have little practical relation to us; yet the perusal of them cannot but be interesting to the Christian reader from their connexion with some of the incidents of the gospel history. We learn from one of the evangelists, that when the mother of our Lord went up to the Temple with her offering in obedience to this law, she was not able to offer a lamb, but was obliged to accept the alternative allowed to the poor, of offering two turtle doves, or two

CHAPTER XII.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a [a]woman have conceived seed, and borne a man-child, then [b]she shall be unclean seven days: [c]according to the days of the separation for her infirmity shall she be unclean.

[a] ch. 15. 19. [b] Luke 2. 22. [c] ch. 15. 19.

3 And in the [d]eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised.

4 And she shall then continue in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days: she shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary, until the days of her purifying be fulfilled.

[d] Gen. 17. 12. Luke 1. 59, and 2. 21. John 7. 22, 23.

young pigeons. Thus an interesting evidence is furnished of the low circumstances of the family into which the Savior was born. While the Israelites remained in the wilderness, it is probable that the women brought their offerings immediately after the period of their separation had expired. But when they were settled in Palestine, and many families lived at a distance from the Temple, it may be presumed that they were allowed to consult their convenience on this point. It is at least certain that after the birth of Samuel, 1 Sam. 1. 21, his mother Hannah did not go to the tabernacle until the child was weaned.

1. *The Lord spake unto Moses, saying*, &c. The directions in this chapter are given to Moses alone, whereas those in the preceding were delivered to him and Aaron conjointly, as are those which follow, ch. 13, respecting the Leprosy. The reason of this was, that it peculiarly devolved upon Aaron and his sons to discriminate in this matter between the clean and unclean; and as it was a matter attended with some difficulty, they are especially charged by God in respect to it. But as the legal purification of a woman was a ceremony of very obvious import and easy execution, it was sufficient that they received their instructions respecting it from Moses.

2. *If a woman have conceived seed and borne a man-child.* Heb. תזרע *tazria, hath seeded, or yielded seed*, equivalent to conception, as it is rendered in the Chal. and other versions, though the usual word to express this idea is חרה *hârâh*, and not זרע *zâra*. The prescribed period of uncleanness on the birth of a male child was to be seven days, on that of a female fourteen. The reason of the distinction is not obvious. Perhaps the most probable suggestion is, that it was intended to conciliate greater respect toward the mother of a male child, having reference to that studied recognition of the superiority of this sex which pervades the Mosaic institutions.——¶ *According to the days of the separation for her infirmity.* Heb. כימי נדת דותה *kimë niddath devothah, according to the days of the separation of her sickness.* On this point the reader may consult ch. 15. 19—25. Throughout this first period of her legal uncleanness she neither partook of any thing that was holy, nor enjoyed intercourse with any person. Even her husband did not eat or drink with her, and those who attended upon her became thereby unclean. After seven days the rigor of this separation was relaxed, as we shall see below. As to the rite of circumcision which was to follow on the eighth day, see Note on Gen. 17. 12.

4. *She shall then continue.* Heb. תשב *tëshib, shall sit*; a common term to express *abiding* or *continuing* in a particular place or state. This 'continuance' in the blood of her purifying was to be reckoned from the end of the seven days above-mentioned, so that the whole time amounted to forty days.

5 But if she bear a maid-child, then she shall be unclean two weeks, as in her separation: and she shall continue in the blood of her purifying three-score and six days.

6 And [e] when the days of her purifying are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb of the first year for a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon, or a turtle-dove, for a sin-offering, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest:

[e] Luke 2. 22.

7 Who shall offer it before the LORD, and make an atonement for her; and she shall be cleansed from the issue of her blood. This *is* the law for her that hath borne a male or a female.

8 [f] And if she be not able to bring a lamb, then she shall bring two turtles, or two young pigeons; the one for the burnt-offering, and the other for a sin-offering: [g] and the priest shall make an atonement for her, and she shall be clean.

[f] ch. 5. 7. Luke 2. 24. [g] ch. 4. 26.

During this latter portion of the time, though she was by no means doomed to an utter separation from all society, yet she was to be debarred from the sanctuary, and from all participation in the sacrifices of the Passover and the Peace-offerings, of which she would otherwise be permitted to eat.

5. *But if she have a maid-child.* In the case of the birth of a daughter, the time of strict separation was just double that prescribed at the birth of a son, and so also was the time of their subsequent purification, it being sixty-six days before she was admitted to the sanctuary. During this time she was said to 'continue in the blood of her purifying,' by which it is not to be understood that there was any thing physically *impure* in the state of the blood at this time. On the contrary, the blood is perfectly pure as to its *quality*, though somewhat excessive in *quantity*, for reasons well known to physiologists. The purification enjoined was wholly of a *ceremonial*, and not at all of a *physical*, kind.

6. *And when the days of her purification are fulfilled*, &c. We have here the divine ordinance as to the manner in which the close of this period of purification should be celebrated. On the forty-first day from the birth of the child, if a male, or the eighty-first, if a female, the mother was to appear at the tabernacle, with the present of a two-fold offering, by way of testimony to her grateful sense of the mercies vouchsafed to her;—the one a burnt-offering of a lamb of the first year, and the other a sin-offering of a young pigeon or a turtle-dove. We notice, however, in the connexion a kindly provision in behalf of those who were not able, from extreme poverty, to bring a lamb on this occasion. They might commute the offering by doubling the oblation of birds; and this we learn from the Evangelist, Luke 2. 24, was done by the mother of our Lord. What a striking view does this afford us of the circumstances in which He was ushered into life, who was not only heir to the throne of David, but appointed also to be 'Lord of lords and King of kings!'

CHAPTER XIII.

Among the various diseases to which the Israelites were subject, none was so odious, so formidable, so incurable as the Leprosy, which forms the subject of the present chapter. Although this disease was not peculiar to the Jews, as it prevailed in Egypt, Syria, and the northern part of upper Asia, yet it was regarded by the chosen people as proceeding immediately from the hand of God, and was always considered as a punishment for sin. Accordingly it was usually denominated by them נגע

CHAPTER XIII.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 When a man shall have in the skin of his flesh a rising, [a] a scab, or bright spot, and it be in the skin of his flesh, *like* the plague of leprosy; [b] then he shall be brought unto Aaron the priest, or unto one of his sons the priests:

[a] Deut. 28. 27. Isai. 3. 17.

[b] Deut. 17. 8, 9, and 24. 8. Luke 17. 14.

hannëga, נגע צרעת *nëga tzâraath*, *the stroke or wound*, i. e. by supplying the ellipsis, *the stroke or wound of the Lord*. The disease, though not unknown in modern times, is yet comparatively rare, especially in European countries, and in our own, is scarcely known at all. Its leading characteristic, as outwardly visible, is a *spotted skin*. These spots in the outset are commonly small, resembling the pustules made by the prick of a pin, but they gradually increase in size, and often for a number of years, till they become as large as a coffee-bean, covering the whole body, and finally terminating in ulcers, which penetrate inwardly till they have produced a complete *caries* of the bones, and the whole body becomes little better than a mass of corruption. But spots upon the body resembling these were not always the effect of leprosy; t therefore became important to lay down rules for distinguishing between leprous spots and those which are harmless, and result from other causes. This is the object of the present chapter; and no part of the Levitical code will appear more worthy of its divine author than this, when we consider that it was designed, not wantonly to fix the charge of being a leper upon an innocent person, and thus to impose upon him a load of grievous restraints and inconveniences, but to ascertain in the fairest and most satisfactory manner the real subjects of the scourge, and to separate them from all intercourse with their fellow-men. As this was the prominent aim of the laws on this subject, viz. to secure a fair and impartial decision of the main question, of the *fact* of the disease, Moses has not mentioned those signs of leprosy which admitted of no doubt, but those only which might be the subject of contention, and left it to the priests to distinguish between the *really* leprous, and those who had only the *appearance* of being such.

Rules for distinguishing the Leprosy.

2. *When a man shall have in the skin of his flesh a rising, a scab, or bright spot, and it be in the skin of his flesh like the plague of leprosy.* Heb. והיה לנגע צרעת *vehâyâh lenega tzârâath*, *and it become to a stroke of leprosy*. That is, so as to assume the appearance and excite the suspicion of leprosy. The term 'leprosy,' is derived from the Gr. λεπρα, *lepra*, from λεπις, *a scale*, because in this disease the body was often covered with *thin white scales*, so as to give it the appearance of *snow*. Thus it is said of the hand of Moses, Ex. 4. 6, that it was 'leprous as snow;' and of Miriam, Num. 12. 10, that 'she became *leprous, white as snow*;' so also of Gehazi, 2 Kings, 5. 27, that 'he went from his (Elisha's) presence, a leper *as white as snow*.' This peculiarity of the disease is thus accounted for in the 'Medica Sacra' of Mead. 'The seeds of leprous contagion are mixed with an acrid and salt humor, derived from the blood, which, as it naturally ought partly to have turned into nutriment, and partly to have perspired through the skin, it now lodges and corrodes the little scales of the cuticle, and these becoming dry and white, sometimes even as white as snow, are separated from the skin, and fall off like bran.' The Heb. term is צרעת *tzâraah*, from a root signifying to *strike*, or *smite as with some venomous or infectious matter*. Hence, the true import of the

3 And the priest shall look on the plague in the skin of the flesh: and *when* the hair in the plague is turned white, and the plague in sight *be* deeper than the skin of his flesh, it *is* a plague of leprosy: and the priest shall look on him, and pronounce him unclean.

4 If the bright spot *be* white in the skin of his flesh, and in sight *be* not deeper than the skin, and the hair thereof be not turned

---

original is a *fretting soreness*, or a *piercing infectious scabbiness*, denominated also in the scriptures, 'the plague,' i. e. the 'stroke,' or the 'wound' of leprosy, as the Jews regarded it as a disease sent directly from God as a punishment of sin, Moses having prescribed no natural remedy for the cure of it. In the Chal. it is termed סגרותא *segiruth*, *shutting up*, because it caused men to be secluded from society. This dreadful disease which prevails in Egypt and Syria, generally manifests itself at first, in the manner described in the text. Its commencement is scarcely perceptible; there appearing only a few reddish spots on the skin which are not attended with pain or any other symptom, but which cannot be removed. It increases imperceptibly, and continues for some years to be more and more manifest. The spots become larger, spreading over the skin, till at length they cover the whole body with a leprous scurf. The disease affects at the same time the marrow and the bones; so much so, that the farthest joints in the system gradually lose their powers, and the members fall together in such a manner, as to give the body a mutilated and dreadful appearance. In its final stages, the whole mass of the patient's flesh and blood seems to turn to corruption, and he may be said almost literally to fall to pieces. This disease, though very infrequent in Europe, indeed, almost extinct, made its appearance about the year 1730 in the western continent, and spread its ravages in the sugar islands of the West Indies, particularly Guadaloupe. M. Peysonnel, who was sent to that island in order to acquaint himself with the nature of the disease, observes, after giving the symptoms as above mentioned, that 'as the disease advances, the upper part of the nose swells, the nostrils become enlarged, and the nose itself soft. Tumors appear on the jaws; the eyebrows swell; the ears become thick; the points of the fingers, as also the feet and toes, swell; the nails become scaly; the joints of the hands and feet separate and drop off. On the palms of the hands, and on the soles of the feet, appear deep dry ulcers, which increase rapidly and then disappear again. In short, in the last stage of the disease the patient becomes a hideous spectacle, and falls in pieces. These symptoms supervene by very slow and successive steps, requiring often many years before they all occur. The patient suffers no violent pain, but feels a sort of numbness in his hands and feet. During the whole period of the disorder, those afflicted with it experience no obstruction in what are called the *Naturalia*. They eat and drink as usual; and even when their fingers and toes mortify, the loss of the mortified parts is the only consequence that ensues; for the wound heals of itself without any medical treatment or application. When, however, the unfortunate wretches come to the last period of the disease, they are hideously disfigured, and objects of the greatest compassion.'

3, 4. *Pronounce him unclean.* Heb. תמא אתו *timmë otho*, *shall make him unclean*, or *shall pollute him*; a phraseology of not unfrequent occurrence, by which one is said to *do* that which he merely, in a ministerial capacity, pronounces, predicts, or declares to be done. Thus Ezek. 43. 3, is said to 'destroy the city,' when he simply pronounced

white; then the priest shall shut up *him that hath* the plague seven days:

5 And the priest shall look on him the seventh day: and behold, *if* the plague in his sight be at a stay, *and* the plague spread not in the skin; then the priest shall shut him up seven days more:

6 And the priest shall look on him again the seventh day: and behold, *if* the plague *be* somewhat dark, *and* the plague spread not in the skin, the priest shall pronounce him clean: it *is but* a scab: and he [c] shall wash his clothes, and be clean.

7 But if the scab spread much abroad in the skin, after that he hath been seen of the priest for his cleansing, he shall be seen of the priest again:

[c] ch. 1. 25, and 14. 8.

or prophecied its destruction. In like manner the apostles, as ministers of Christ, are said to have been empowered to *bind* and to *loose*, to remit men's sins, and to *retain* them, when all that is intended is, that they were simply to *declare* them to be so bound or loosed, remitted or retained, according to the tenor of God's word. It is to be observed, that there are three signs of a leprosy stated in the first verse; (1) a tumor or swelling; (2) a scab; (3) a bright spot. Of these indications, the sacred writer begins with the last, viz. the bright spot, in which, if the hair were turned white, and it was not a superficial whiteness merely, but the spot seemed to have eaten deeper, even into the very flesh, then it was beyond doubt that it was a true leprosy. But if upon inspection there merely appeared a white spot in the skin, which had not affected the color of the hair, then it could not be positively determined that the disease was leprosy. But it had some of the symptoms of leprosy, and might prove to be such; at any rate appearances were so far against the person that it was proper he should be separated from others long enough to afford time for an accurate judgment of the nature of the affection. The priest therefore was to shut him up for seven days, during which time it would be apt to develope its true character.—— ¶ *Shall shut up* him that hath *the plague*. The words 'him that hath,' it will be noticed, are not found in the text, of which the true rendering is, 'Shall shut up the plague.' Gr. *αφοριει την ἀφην, shall separate the plague.* This is a usage of the sacred writers, by which the abstract is put for the concrete, often met with, as 'captivity' for 'captives,' Ps. 68. 19; 'the hoary head' for 'hoary headed person,' Lev. 19. 32; 'rebellion' for 'the rebellious,' Ezek. 44. 6; 'a charge' for 'those having charge,' Ezek. 44. 11; 'pride' for 'proud man,' Jer. 50. 31; 'circumcision for 'those circumcised,' Rom. 2. 26.

5. *If the plague in his sight be at a stay.* Heb. נגע עמד *nëga âmad, the plague stand.* If the priest, at the week's end, saw no alteration in the symptoms, as the case remained dubious, he was to prolong the period of separation another seven days, and if at the end of that time the appearance of the affected part continued the same, except that the white spot began to assume a somewhat darkish hue, then he was to pronounce him clean, i. e. free from the plague of leprosy. Still as the very cause that had led to his being suspected showed that there was some degree of impurity in his blood, a slight purification was prescribed, the moral effect of which would naturally be to teach that the very appearance of evil is an adequate ground of humiliation to any one that fears God.

7. *If the scab spread much.* The real leprosy might after all lurk in the system, notwithstanding the rigid examination and the probationary seclusion

8 And *if* the priest see that behold, the scab spreadeth in the skin, then the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* a leprosy.

9 ¶ When the plague of leprosy is in a man, then he shall be brought unto the priest:

10 [d] And the priest shall see *him:* and behold, *if* the rising *be* white in the skin, and it have turned the hair white, and *there be* quick raw flesh in the rising:

11 It *is* an old leprosy in the skin of his flesh, and the priest shall pronounce him unclean, and shall not shut him up: for he *is* unclean.

12 And if a leprosy break out abroad in the skin, and the leprosy cover all the skin of *him that hath* the plague from his head even to his foot, wheresoever the priest looketh;

13 Then the priest shall consider: and behold, *if* the leprosy have covered all his flesh, he shall pronounce *him* clean *that hath* the plague; it is all turned white: he *is* clean.

[d] Numb. 12. 10, 12. 2 Kings 5. 27. 2 Chron. 26. 20.

---

to which the person had been subjected. If the scab spread subsequently in the skin, the symptom was decisive, and the priest was to give his verdict of 'unclean' accordingly; and Maimonides tells us, that if any one were so profane as to neglect his case under these circumstances, and to forbear going to the priest for his judgment, the penalty was, to have his leprosy cleave to him through life.

10. *If the rising be white in the skin*, &c. These symptoms were peculiar to the first form of leprosy mentioned, v. 2, viz. that of the tumor or swelling. If in addition to the whiteness on the skin, and the hair turning white, there was also the presence of quick raw flesh in the swelling, it was an indubitable sign of an old or inveterate leprosy, which had been long seated in the system, and the priest was at once to pronounce him unclean, without the ceremony of a previous shutting up, which was ordered in doubtful cases only. Here the case was too plain to admit of doubt.

Distinction of Leprosy from a Cutaneous Eruption very much resembling it.

12, 13. *If a leprosy break out abroad*, &c. The precept in this case appears singular. Why should the partial leper be pronounced unclean, while the person totally covered with the disease was to be pronounced clean? The true answer perhaps is, that it was owing to a different species or a different stage of the disease; the partial being infectious, the total not. The fact moreover that the disease was driven out to the surface argued a sound and healthy state of the system in general. Yet it is but proper to remark, that Patrick takes entirely a different view of the drift of this passage. He supposes that that which is here called 'leprosy' was not truly such, but another disease having so strong a resemblance to the leprosy, as to prompt the writer to give it the same denomination. But the difference lay in the fact, that in this *quasi*-leprosy the skin was *entirely covered* by one continuous scurf, whereas in the true leprosy, the spots or scabs did not run together in the manner here intimated, but gave a sort of scaly appearance to the body. This universal eruption from head to foot, however loathsome to the eye, might still be harmless in itself, and perhaps a relief to the morbid internal condition of the body, as in the case of measles and small-pox. The man, therefore, under these circumstances was to be pronounced clean.——¶ *Shall pronounce* him *clean* that hath *the plague*. Heb. טהר אתו הנגע *tâhar eth hannâga, shall clean the plague*; i. e. shall pronounce clean

14 But when raw flesh appeareth in him, he shall be unclean.

15 And the priest shall see the raw flesh, and pronounce him to be unclean: *for* the raw flesh *is* unclean: it *is* a leprosy.

16 Or if the raw flesh turn again, and be changed into white, he shall come unto the priest;

17 And the priest shall see him: and behold, *if* the plague be turned into white; then the priest shall pronounce *him* clean *that hath* the plague: he *is* clean.

18 ¶ The flesh also, in which, *even* in the skin thereof, was a [e] boil, and is healed,

19 And in the place of the bile there be a white rising, or a bright spot, white, and somewhat reddish, and it be showed to the priest;

20 And if, when the priest seeth it, behold, it *be* in sight lower than the skin, and the hair thereof be turned white; the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* a plague of leprosy broken out of the bile.

21 But if the priest look on it, and behold, *there be* no white hairs therein, and *if* it *be* not lower than the skin, but *be* somewhat dark; then the priest shall shut him up seven days:

22 And if it spread much abroad in the skin, then the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* a plague.

23 But if the bright spot stay in his place, *and* spread not, it *is* a burning boil; and the priest shall pronounce him clean

24 ¶ Or if there be *any* flesh, in the skin, whereof *there is* a hot

[e] Exod. 9. 9.

---

him that hath the plague, as rightly rendered in the English translation. See above the Note on v. 3.

14–17. *But when raw flesh appeareth in him*, &c. That is, sound flesh, Gr. χροως ζων, *living flesh*. If patches of sound or natural flesh appeared intermingled with the white scurf or scales, the presumption was, that the genuine leprosy was upon him, which was to be thus distinguished from that cutaneous eruption mentioned above. Still even this sign might be fallacious, as the sound parts of the skin, or the 'raw flesh,' might ere long become white like the rest, and then the proof would be decisive that it was not leprosy, and the priest was to pronounce him clean.

Distinction of Leprosy, when occasioned by a former Sore or Ulcer.

18–23. *The flesh also in which, even in the skin thereof, was a boil*, &c. Chal. 'The man also in whose skin,' &c. In this and the following verses, the writer treats of those cases of leprosy that rose from old ulcers that had once been healed. Such cicatrized sores might break out afresh and prove a real leprosy. A person with any sore or disposition to contagion, was more likely to catch the infection from contact with the diseased person, than he was whose skin was whole and sound, and his habits good. The requisite rules of discrimination in such cases, are here given.——¶ *In the place of the boil.* In the place where the boil formerly broke out, but seemed afterwards to be healed. The original word for 'boil' is שחין *she'hin*, the explanation of which see in the Note on Ex. 9. 9.

Distinction of Leprosy, when occasioned by a former Burning.

24–28. *In the skin whereof there is a hot burning.* Heb. מכוית אש *mikvath ësh, burning of fire.* The case alluded to is probably one where a burning coal, or hot iron, or something of that nature had fallen upon the flesh and caused an inflammation that might easily give rise to leprosy if a predisposition to it already existed. Horsley, however, supposes the 'hot burning' was an

burning, and the quick *flesh* that burneth have a white bright spot, somewhat reddish, or white;

25 Then the priest shall look upon it: and behold, *if* the hair in the bright spot be turned white, and it *be in* sight deeper than the skin; it *is* a leprosy broken out of the burning: wherefore the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* the plague of leprosy.

26 But if the priest look on it, and, behold, *there be* no white hair in the bright spot, and it *be* no lower than the *other* skin, but *be* somewhat dark; then the priest shall shut him up seven days:

27 And the priest shall look upon him the seventh day: *and* if it be spread much abroad in the skin, then the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* the plague of leprosy.

28 And if the bright spot stay in his place, *and* spread not in the skin, but it *be* somewhat dark; it *is* a rising of the burning, and the priest shall pronounce him clean: for it *is* an inflammation of the burning.

29 ¶ If a man or woman have a plague upon the head or the beard;

30 Then the priest shall see the plague: and behold, if it *be* in sight deeper than the skin, and *there be* in it a yellow thin hair; then the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* a dry scall, *even* a leprosy upon the head or beard.

31 And if the priest look on the plague of the scall, and behold, it *be* not in sight deeper than the skin, and *that there is* no black hair in it; then the priest shall shut up *him that hath* the plague of the scall seven days:

32 And in the seventh day the priest shall look on the plague: and behold, *if* the scall spread not, and there be in it no yellow hair, and the scall *be* not in sight deeper than the skin;

33 He shall be shaven, but the scall shall he not shave; and the priest shall shut up *him that hath* the scall seven days more:

34 And in the seventh day the priest shall look on the scall: and behold, *if* the scall be not spread in the skin, nor *be* in sight deeper than the skin; then the priest shall pronounce him clean: and he shall wash his clothes, and be clean.

35 But if the scall spread much in the skin after his cleansing;

36 Then the priest shall look on him: and behold, if the scall be spread in the skin, the priest shall not seek for yellow hair; he *is* unclean.

37 But if the scall be in his sight at a stay, and *that* there is black hair grown up therein; the scall is healed, he *is* clean: and the priest shall pronounce him clean.

38 ¶ If a man also or a woman have in the skin of their flesh bright spots, *even* bright white spots;

---

erysipelas or *St. Anthony's fire*. What ever it were, the case was to be determined by the rules here given.

Distinction of Leprosy from Dry-scall.

29–37. *It is a dry-scall.* Heb. נתק *nâthek*. Gr. θραυσμα εστι, *it is a broken sore*. The original comes from the root נתק *nâthak*, *to pluck, tear*, or *draw off*, and is the name of a disease peculiar to the head or beard, so called from the hairs being *drawn off* from the place where it broke out, and leaving a morbid baldness in its stead. The Hebrews describe it thus: 'The plague of the head or beard, is when the hair that is on them falleth off by the roots, and the place of the hair remaineth bare; and this is that which is called 'nethek.'"

Distinction of Leprosy from the 'Bohak' or Freckled Spot.

38. *If a man also or a woman.* The species of leprosy here defined is dis-

39 Then the priest shall look: and behold, *if* the bright spots in the skin of their flesh *be* darkish white; it *is* a freckled spot *that* groweth in the skin; he *is* clean.

40 And the man whose hair is fallen off his head, he *is* bald; *yet is* he clean.

41 And he that hath his hair fallen off from the part of his head toward his face, he *is* forehead-bald; *yet is* he clean.

42 And if there be in the bald head, or bald forehead, a white reddish sore; it *is* a leprosy sprung up in his bald head, or his bald forehead.

43 Then the priest shall look upon it: and behold, *if* the rising of the sore *be* white reddish in his bald head, or in his bald forehead, as the leprosy appeareth in the skin of the flesh;

44 He is a leprous man, he *is* unclean: the priest shall pronounce him utterly unclean; his plague *is* in his head.

45 And the leper in whom the plague *is*, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall [f] put a covering upon his upper lip, and shall cry, [g] Unclean, unclean.

[f] Ezek. 24. 17. 22. Mic. 3. 7. [g] Lam. 4. 15.

---

tinguished from others by the term בהק *bohak*, from the Syriac '*bohak*,' *to be white or shining*. The word is used to denote a cutaneous eruption, of which Niebuhr says, 'I myself saw a case of the *Bohak* leprosy in a Jew at Mocha. The spots in this disease are of unequal size. They have no shining appearance; nor are they perceptibly elevated above the skin; and they do not change the color of the hair. Their color is an obscure white, or somewhat reddish. The rest of the skin of this patient was blacker than that of the people of the country is in general; but the spots were not so white as the skin of an European, when not sun-burnt. The spots, in this species of leprosy, do not appear on the hands, nor about the navel, but on the neck and face; not, however, on that part of the head where the hair grows very thick. They gradually spread, and continue sometimes only about two months; but in some cases, indeed, as long as two years, and then disappear, by degrees, of themselves. This disorder is neither infectious nor hereditary, nor does it occasion *any* inconvenience.'

Distinction of Leprosy from Baldness.

40–44. *The man whose hair is fallen off his head*, &c. 'Another description of persons, for whose exemption from the charge and hardships of leprosy Moses took care to provide, were those whose heads became bald. Among us, and indeed in any country where leprosy is not extremely prevalent, such persons require no such attention; for nobody would think of accounting a man leprous because his head happened to become prematurely bald, were it even in the days of his youth. As, however, the falling of the hair is sometimes, and in connection with other symptoms, a strong criterion of leprosy, and as there actually is a particular kind of leprosy, which might, perhaps, even then, have been observed to have the peculiarity of being limited either to the fore or hind part of the head, it was not strange that a person who became bald, and more especially if not very far advanced in years, should incur the suspicion of being leprous. Now in such cases, we find Moses giving an explanation, viz. that if no farther symptoms were found than mere baldness, the person was not to lie under the suspicion of leprosy, but to be considered as clean.'—*Michaelis*

Conduct to be observed by Lepers.

45. *The leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent.* The leprous person was required to be as one that

46 All the days wherein the plague *shall be* in him he shall be defiled; he *is* unclean: he shall dwell alone, [h] without the camp *shall* his habitation *be*.

47 ¶ The garment also that the plague of leprosy is in, *whether it be* a woollen garment, or a linen garment;

48 Whether *it be* in the warp, or woof, of linen, or of woollen: whether in a skin, or in any thing made of skin:

49 And if the plague be greenish

[h] Numb. 5. 2, and 12. 14, 2 Kings 7. 3, and 15. 5. 2 Chron. 26. 21. Luke 17. 12.

---

mourned for the dead, or for some great and public calamity. He was to have his clothes rent in token of extreme sorrow; his head was to be made bare; the ordinary bonnet or turban being omitted, and to *have a covering upon the upper lip*; or rather, as the original word 'upper lip' is with equal probability interpreted *of the whole chin*, he was to have the lower part of his face bound around with a bandage, leaving the mouth just freedom enough to make the declaration, *unclean! unclean!* which uttered from lips thus muffled up, must have been sounded forth in a peculiarly doleful accent. The reason of uttering this cry was to prevent any person from coming near him, lest defilement might be incurred by contact. Therefore the Chal. renders it, 'Be ye not made unclean! be ye not made unclean!' and Tar. Jon. 'Avoid! avoid the unclean!' In allusion to this it is said, Lam. 4. 15, 'They cried unto them, depart ye; (I am) unclean; depart, depart, touch not.' In the East lepers are not at this day absolutely interdicted from going abroad, for they are not considered as pestilential. Niebuhr says, 'I might have seen numbers of them; but whenever I observed any of them meeting me in the streets, I deemed it prudent to avoid them.'

46. *He shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be.* Heb. בדד ישב *bâdad yëshëb, he shall sit alone.* Gr. κεχωρισμενος καθησεται, *he shall sit separated.* This was a salutary precaution for the sake of the sound, and the temporary seclusion might easily be turned to a useful account to the leper himself; for there was every thing in his condition calculated to admonish him of his moral defilement, and prompt him to seek for an effectual cleansing of that inner malady which was so strikingly set forth by the loathsome leprosy that covered his body. The law here enacted seems to have been strictly observed. So early as the second year of the Exodus, lepers were obliged to reside without the camp, Numb. 5. 1–4; and so strictly was this law enforced, that the sister of Moses himself becoming leprous, was expelled from it, Numb. 12. 14–16. When the Israelites came into their own land, and lived in cities, the spirit of the law thus far operated, that lepers were obliged to reside in a separate place, which was called בית חפשית *beth 'hophshith, the house of uncleanness*; and from this seclusion, not even kings, when they became leprous, were exempted, 2 Kings 15. 5.

The Leprosy of Garments.

47. *The garment also that the plague of leprosy is in.* This leprosy in garments appears so strange to us, that it has induced some to consider it as an extraordinary punishment inflicted by God upon the Israelites, as a sign of his displeasure against sin; while others consider the leprosy in clothes, as also in houses, as having no relation to the leprosy in man. Indeed, the probability is that the term 'leprosy,' in this connexion, is not intended to be used in the same sense in which it is applied to denote a disease affecting the human system, but has rather a figurative import, just as 'cancer' is used by agriculturists in reference to a disease of trees,

or reddish in the garment, or in the skin, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in any thing of skin; it *is* a plague of leprosy, and shall be showed unto the priest:

50 And the priest shall look upon the plague, and shut up *it that hath* the plague seven days:

51 And he shall look on the plague on the seventh day: if the

---

and as, inversely, the word 'rot' is applied to a disease of sheep, though primitively used of the decomposition of timber. The language was no doubt intended to intimate that the garment was fretted by a process similar to that which takes place in the skin in a case of real leprosy, occasioned in all likelihood, by a species of animalcula or vermin, which by breeding in the garments must necessarily multiply their kind, and *fret* the threads, i. e. corrode a portion of the finer parts after the manner of moths, for their nourishment. It is thus that the human skin is affected in the itch, a disease caused by the *psora*, or itch animal, which is often communicated from garments. This plague of vestments is termed, v. 51, a 'fretting (or rankling) leprosy,' a word which is applied in Ezek. 28. 24, to a 'pricking' or 'rankling brier,' and is strikingly expressive of the sensation produced by the irritating effect of the itch in the human subject. We may suppose, moreover, that the metaphorical term 'leprosy' was used in this connexion on account of the disgusting ideas which, by association with the human disease, the view of a blemish in clothing, called also 'leprosy,' would excite in the mind. So much in respect to the term. As to the fact indicated by it, the inquiries of Michaelis on the subject have brought out the following results, which are well worth transcribing in his own words. 'The leprosy of clothes is described as consisting of green or reddish spots, that remain in spite of washing, and still spread; and by which the cloth becomes bald or bare, sometimes on the one side, sometimes on the other. This Moses terms *dropping or losing the hair*; that is, if we are to give the literal truth of the Hebrew text, in a passage which might have its difficulties to a man of learning, if he knew nothing of the manufacture of woollen. These symptoms, too, of leprosy, are said to be found sometimes only in the *warp*, and at other times only in the *woof*. To a person who has nothing to do with the manufactures of woollen, linen, or leather, but with books only, this must doubtless be obscure; or, at most, he will be led to think of specks of rottenness, but still without being rightly satisfied. I have not been able to obtain complete information on this subject; but in regard to wool, and woolen stuffs, I have consulted the greatest manufacturer in the electorate of Hanover; and he informs me, that what he has read in my German Bible, at this passage, will be found to hold good, at any rate with regard to woollen articles; and that it proceeds from what is called *dead wool*, that is, the wool of sheep that have died by disease, not by the knife: that such wool, if the disease has been but of short duration, is not altogether useless, but in a sheep that has been long diseased, becomes extremely bad, and loses the points; and that, according to the established usage of honest manufacturers, it is unfair to manufacture dead wool into any article worn by man; because vermin are so apt to establish themselves in it, particularly when it is worn close to the body and warmed thereby. When I told him, that in the countries, with a view to which I questioned him, the people, for want of linen and from poverty, had always worn, and still wear, woollen stuffs next the skin, he stated it as his opinion that there the disagreeable effect just mentioned, must take place in a still higher degree than in countries

plague be spread in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in a skin, *or* in any work that is made of skin: the plague *is* [i] a fretting leprosy; it *is* unclean.

52 He shall therefore burn that garment, whether warp or woof, in woollen or in linen, or any thing of skin, wherein the plague is: for it *is* a fretting leprosy; it shall be burnt in the fire.

53 And if the priest shall look, and behold, the plague be not spread in the garment, either in the warp or in the woof, or in any thing of skin;

54 Then the priest shall command that they wash *the thing* wherein the plague *is*, and he shall shut it up seven days more:

55 And the priest shall look on the plague after that it is washed: and behold, *if* the plague have not changed his colour, and the plague be not spread; it *is* unclean; thou shalt burn it in the fire; it *is* fret inward, *whether* it *be* bare within or without.

56 And if the priest look, and behold, the plague *be* somewhat dark after the washing of it; then he shall send it out of the garment, or out of the skin, or out of the warp, or out of the woof:

57 And if it appear still in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in any thing of skin; it *is* a spreading *plague:* thou shalt burn that wherein the plague *is* with fire.

58 And the garment, either warp, or woof, or whatsoever thing of skin *it be*, which thou shalt wash, if the plague be departed from them, then it shall be washed the second time, and shall be clean.

59 This *is* the law of the plague of leprosy in a garment of woollen or linen, either in the warp or woof, or any thing of skins, to pronounce it clean, or to pronounce it unclean.

[i] ch. 14. 44.

---

where, according to our German fashion, which would there be a luxury, a linen shirt is worn between the woollen clothes and the body. He added, that dead wool was usually manufactured into sacks and horse-cloths; and he expressed his wish for a statute, in the style of Moses, which should discourage the use of dead wool, or inflict a punishment on those who either sold it, or knowingly manufactured it into human clothing.—I am likewise informed by Hamburghers, that in their neighborhood, many frauds are committed with dead wool, from its being sold for good wool; in consequence of which, the stuffs made of it not only become very soon bare, but full first of little depressions, and then of holes.'—*Comment. on L. M. Art.* 211.

Remarks.—(2.) Nothing that entered into the Levitical system, which we are now considering, was more remarkably fraught with symbolical import than the portion concerning the treatment of the leper. Other parts of the ritual taught impressively the *fearful effects* of sin; this taught its *defiling nature*. No conceivable affliction or disease could form so striking a representation of that moral malady which has befallen our nature. We see in the leprosy a lively emblem of that universal depravity which has corrupted our souls. The effects of this deadly spiritual defilement are typically set forth in lively colors in the enactments before us. He upon whom it appeared was put out of the camp or city in which he dwelt, and was forced to live alone, cut off from all social intercourse. So with sin. It does not indeed literally shut us out from the society of our fellow-creatures, but it renders us odious in the sight of God, separates between us

CHAPTER XIV.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing:

---

and him, precludes us from all cordial fellowship with his people, and unless we be cleansed from it in the appointed way, it will effectually forbid our entrance into his heavenly temple. The unpurified and unrenewed sinner is morally unclean, and has no spiritual health in him; he is without God and without Christ in the world; and from the very necessity of his corrupt nature, he is excluded from the privileges and blessings of God's people. When king Uzziah was smitten with the leprosy in the temple, all the priests with one accord rose upon him, and 'thrust him out' of the temple; yea, he himself also 'hasted to go out.' And thus it would be in heaven, if by any means an unrenewed sinner were admitted there; he would be 'thrust out,' as unworthy of a place in that pure abode; and he would no doubt haste to flee out, from a consciousness of the same fact.

(2.) Upon the smallest appearance of the leprosy, the subject of it was to subject himself to instant examination. He must not trust to his own judgment, but must apply to those whom God had authorized to determine the point, according to the rules prescribed. If this could not be done at once, more time was taken, till the fact became evident. What does this show to us, but that we must take every means of discovering the plague-spot of our own hearts? We must not be afraid of knowing the worst. We must have recourse to the word and to the ministers of the word, that by their help we may know the evil that is in us. Above all, we must go to God, who searcheth the heart, and trieth the reins, and say, 'Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts.' However clear we may be in our own eyes, we must say with Paul, 'I judge not mine own self; for I know nothing by myself (i. e. against myself); yet am I not hereby justified, but he that justifieth me is the Lord.'

(6.) 'The priest shall pronounce him clean.' But why not pronounce him *cured?* The fact is, there was nothing prescribed, nor any thing to be attempted by way of cure for this disease. Hence the removal of it is generally expressed by the word *cleansing*. And certain it is, in like manner, that none but God can deliver us from sin. No self-righteous works, no superstitious devices, no human efforts, have ever been able to expel it out of the soil of the depraved heart. The blood of Christ alone can avail to this; and then it is not in this life *eradicated*, but *forgiven*, just as the Jewish leper is not said to have been *cured*, but *cleansed*, as though the idea of the *defilement* were more prominent in the mind of the lawgiver than that of the *disease*.

(45.) 'Shall cry, Unclean, unclean!' Who does not see in this the manner in which we are to acknowledge and bewail the corruption of our nature? Who does not recognize the fitting expression of a gospel penitent, convinced of sin? Does he not feel the profoundest grief and shame? Does he not acknowledge himself a miserable and polluted sinner? So if *we* are made truly sensible of our own sinful condition, we shall rend our hearts, and not our garments; we shall lay our souls bare before the heart-searching God; our mouths will be stopped, for we shall know ourselves to be guilty; we shall smite each one upon our breast, and cry, 'God be merciful to me a sinner!'

CHAPTER XIV.

The Law of the Purification of the Leper.

2. *This shall be the law of the leper*, &c. That is, this is the mode which

He [a] shall be brought unto the priest:

3 And the priest shall go forth out of the camp: and the priest shall look, and behold, *if* the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper;

4 Then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds alive *and* clean, and

[a] Matt. 8. 2. 4. Mark 1. 40, 44. Luke 5. 12, 14, and 17. 14.

God hath ordained for cleansing a leper, or qualifying him to be pronounced clean, and thus restored to the communion of God's people.——¶ *He shall be brought unto the priest.* He was to be conducted from his 'several (separate) house,' to the borders of the camp, whither the priest was to go forth to meet him, and to perform the requisite examination. As this coming to the priest was required of the leper in every instance, however thoroughly he might have been healed, therefore, our Savior said to the leper whom he had healed, Matt. 8. 4, 'Go show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded.'

4. *Then shall the priest command to take for him,* &c. Heb. צוה הכהן ולקח *tzivvâh hakkohën ve-lakah, and the priest shall command, and he shall take;* i. e. the leper shall take. It was probably in order to avoid ambiguity as to the person, that our translators adopted the mode of rendering which appears in the text. Of the cedar wood, hyssop, clean bird, and scarlet wool, were made an instrument to sprinkle with. The cedar served for the handle, the hyssop and living bird were attached to it, by means of the scarlet wool or crimson fillet. The bird was so bound to this handle, as that its tail should be downwards, in order to be dipt into the blood of the bird that had been killed. By this means the blood was sprinkled, and when this was done, the living bird was let loose and permitted to go whithersoever it would. The *general purport* of the ceremonies here prescribed, was to point out the purification of the soul through the atonement and spirit of Christ, but it is vain to attempt to fix with any positiveness the spiritual import of each particular rite. Yet it may not be amiss to give the explanation of R. Abarbanel who imagines that these four things had reference by contrast to the four evils under which he had labored, and from which by his cure he was delivered. The *living bird* denoted, according to him, that the *dead flesh* was restored to its wonted life and vigor; the *cedar wood*, which is not easily corrupted, that the *rottenness* and *corruption* produced by the leprosy was cured, and his flesh become sound and healthy; the *scarlet wool*, that his blood, by being cleansed of its impurities, had again sssumed its *florid hue*, and given new *freshness* and *bloom* to the complexion; and *the hyssop*, a strongly odoriferous plant, that the ill savor and every other species of offensiveness pertaining to the disease, had passed away.——¶ *Two birds alive.* Heb. צפורים *tzipporim*, rendered in the margin *sparrows*, as it is also by Jerome and many other interpreters. But it is evident from an attentive perusal of the verse, that it signifies birds in general; for if the sparrow was a clean bird, there could be no use in commanding a clean one to be taken, since every one of the species was ceremonially clean; but if it was unclean by law, then it could not be called clean. The term here must therefore signify birds in general, of which some were ceremonially clean, and some unclean; which rendered the specification in the command proper and necessary. From the terms of the law it appears, that any species of clean birds might be taken on such occasions, domestic or wild; provided only they were clean, and the use of them conceded by the laws of Moses to the people. Accordingly the

[b] cedar-wood, and [c] scarlet, and [d] hyssop.

5 And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel, over running water.

6 As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them, and the living bird, in the blood of the bird *that was* killed over the running water.

7 And he shall [e] sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy [f] seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field.

8 And he that is to be cleansed [g] shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, [h] and wash himself in water, that he may be clean:

[b] Numb. 19. 6. [c] Heb. 9. 19. [d] Ps. 51. 7. [e] Heb. 9. 13. [f] 2 Kings 5, 10, 14. [g] ch. 13. 6. [h] ch. 11. 25.

and after that he shall come into the camp, and [i] shall tarry abroad out of his tent seven days.

9 But it shall be on the seventh day, that he shall shave all his hair off his head, and his beard, and his eye-brows, even all his hair he shall shave off; and he shall wash his clothes, also he shall wash his flesh in water, and he shall be clean.

10 And on the eighth day [k] he shall take two he-lambs without blemish, and one ewe-lamb of the first year without blemish, and three tenth-deals of fine flour *for* [l] a meat-offering, mingled with oil, and one log of oil.

11 And the priest that maketh *him* clean, shall present the man that is to be made clean, and those things, before the LORD, *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

[i] Numb. 12. 15. [k] Matt. 8. 4. Mark 1. 44. Luke 5. 14. [l] ch. 2. 1. Numb. 15. 4. 15.

Gr. renders it very properly δυο ορνιθια, *two little birds.*——¶ *And scarlet.* That is, a lock of wool which had been dyed in purple or scarlet dye.——¶ *Hyssop.* See Note on Ex. 12. 22.

5. *Killed in an earthen vessel, over running water.* The question will here very naturally occur, how the bird could properly be said to be killed over 'running' water, when it was to be at the same time in an 'earthen vessel.' But the apparent discrepancy is removed at once when we remark, that the phrase in the original is מים חיים *mayim hayim, living water*, and that nothing more is meant than that the bird was to be killed over an earthen vessel partly filled with fresh, spring, or living water, in opposition to that which had been employed for any other purpose, or was stale from long standing. And so wherever the same epithet occurs elsewhere in the present chapter.——¶ *Shall let the living bird loose into the open field.* Perhaps to intimate symbolically, that the leper was now released from his confinement, and restored to free intercourse with society, as the *scape-bird* was to the rest of its kind.

The Offering required to be brought for his further cleansing.

10. *And on the eighth day he shall take two he-lambs*, &c. After having submitted to the seven days' restriction, or quarantine, in the manner prescribed above, the recovered leper was required, on the day immediately succeeding, to bring, in order to complete his purification, a trespass, a sin, and a burnt-offering;—a male lamb for each of the former, and a female for the latter. Annexed to each he was to present a meal offering, consisting of an omer of flour with oil to make it into bread or cakes, and another log, or half pint of oil, by itself, for another purpose. v. 15. 16. As the accompanying ceremonies were substantially the same with those already detailed in preceding chapters, it

12 And the priest shall take one he-lamb, and [m] offer him for a trespass-offering, and the log of oil, and [n] wave them *for* a wave-offering before the LORD.

13 And he shall slay the lamb [o] in the place where he shall kill the sin-offering and the burnt-offering, in the holy place: for [p] as the sin-offering *is* the priest's, *so is* the trespass-offering: [q] it *is* most holy.

14 And the priest shall take *some* of the blood of the trespass-offering, and the priest shall put *it* [r] upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot.

15 And the priest shall take *some* of the log of oil, and pour *it* into the palm of his own left hand:

16 And the priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that *is* in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the LORD.

17 And of the rest of the oil that *is* in his hand, shall the priest put upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot, upon the blood of the trespass-offering.

18 And the remnant of the oil that *is* in the priest's hand he shall pour upon the head of him that is to be cleansed: [s] and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the LORD.

19 And the priest shall offer [t] the sin-offering, and make an atonement for him that is to be cleansed from his uncleanness; and afterward he shall kill the burnt-offering.

20 And the priest shall offer the burnt-offering, and the meat-offering upon the altar: and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and he shall be clean.

21 And [u] if he *be* poor, and cannot get so much; then he shall take one lamb *for* a trespass-offering to be waved, to make an atonement for him, and one tenth-deal of fine flour mingled with oil for a meat-offering, and a log of oil;

22 [w] And two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, such as he is able to get; and the one shall be a sin-offering, and the other a burnt-offering.

23 [x] And he shall bring them on

[m] ch. 5. 2, 18, and 6. 6, 7. [n] Exod. 29. 24. [o] Exod. 29. 11. ch. 1. 5, 11, and 4. 4, 24. [p] ch. 7. 7. [q] ch. 2. 3, and 7. 6, and 21. 22. [r] Exod. 29. 20. ch. 8. 23.

[s] ch. 4. 26. [t] ch. 5. 1, 6, and 12. 7. [u] ch. 5. 7, and 12. 8. [w] ch. 12. 8, and 15. 14, 15. [x] ver. 11.

---

will be unnecessary to dwell upon the various particulars. For these the reader can consult Ainsworth or Patrick.

14. *The priest shall put it upon the tip of his right ear*, &c. Probably to denote, by this significant act, that now his sin being graciously remitted, and he received again into communion with his people, he was laid under fresh obligation to *hearken* heedfully to the divine commands, and to render a more *active* and *strenuous* service to his heavenly Benefactor. See Note on Ex. 29. 20, where this ceremony in reference to the priests is fully explained.

Commutation of Offerings appointed for the Poor.

21, 22. *If he be poor, and cannot get so much.* Heb. אין ידו משגת *ain yado massegeth, his hand attain it not;* an idiom occasionally elsewhere occurring, and indicating *want of ability*, as below, v. 22, 30, 31. Lev. 27. 8. On the provision itself see the remarks in the Note on Lev. 5. 7.

23–32. *And he shall bring them*, &c. The same circumstances and ceremonies were to mark the offering of the poor leper as of the rich. His lamb was to

the eighth day for his cleansing unto the priest, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, before the LORD.

24 [y] And the priest shall take the lamb of the trespass-offering, and the log of oil, and the priest shall wave them *for* a wave-offering before the LORD.

25 And he shall kill the lamb of the trespass-offering, [z] and the priest shall take *some* of the blood of the trespass-offering, and put *it* upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot.

26 And the priest shall pour of the oil into the palm of his own left hand.

27 And the priest shall sprinkle with his right finger *some* of the oil that *is* in his left hand seven times before the LORD:

28 And the priest shall put of the oil that *is* in his hand, upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot, upon the place of the blood of the trespass-offering.

29 And the rest of the oil that *is* in the priest's hand, he shall put upon the head of him that is to be cleansed, to make an atonement for him before the LORD.

30 And he shall offer the one of [a] the turtle-doves, or of the young pigeons, such as he can get;

31 *Even* such as he is able to get, the one *for* a sin-offering, and the other *for* a burnt-offering, with the meat-offering. And the priest shall make an atonement for him that is to be cleansed, before the LORD.

32 This *is* the law *of him* in whom *is* the plague of leprosy, whose hand is not able to get [b] *that which pertaineth* to his cleansing.

33 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying,

34 [c] When ye be come into the land of Canaan, which I give to you for a possession, and I put the plague of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession;

[y] ver. 12. [z] ver. 14.

[a] ver. 22. ch. 15. 15. [b] ver. 10. [c] Gen. 17. 18. Numb. 32. 22. Deut. 7. 1, and 32. 49

be waved; its blood smeared upon his ear, thumb, and toe; which were also to be anointed with the oil out of the log; and his turtle and pigeon offered to the same effect, and with like availableness as in the foregoing cases.

The Detection and Cleansing of Leprosy in Houses.

34. *When—I put the plague of leprosy in a house*, &c. This language would appear at first blush to countenance the idea generally entertained by the Jews, that the leprosy was a supernatural disease, inflicted immediately by God himself. But in the Hebrew idiom God is often said to *do* what, in the course of his providence, he merely *permits* to be done. 'The house-leprosy here described has occasioned much perplexity to inquirers; and the difficulty has probably arisen from being led by the name to look upon this 'leprosy,' as well as that in clothes, as something akin to the human disease so called. Men, clothes, and stones have not the same diseases, but from some analogous circumstances, real or fanciful, the diseases of men may be, and have been, by a figure of speech, applied to diseases in other things. Indeed, to this day, there are certain disorders of trees in Egypt and Palestine to which the name of 'leprosy' is given. In Switzerland, also, they speak of a *cancer in buildings* on the same principle; and why should we not understand the *leprosy in buildings* of the present text as something of a similar description? If we believe that the house-leprosy was any

thing related to the disorder of the same name in man, it is extremely difficult to account for the symptoms and mode of treatment, and we cannot perhaps do better than agree with the Rabbins and some of the early Christian fathers, who believed that this leprosy was not natural, but was sent by God as an extraordinary punishment upon evil-doers, to compel them to the public acknowledgment and atonement of some undetected crime, whereby others had been injured. Calmet, however, seems to think that this disorder was caused by animalcula, which eroded the stone like mites in a cheese, and might then be called leprosy, because, according to his theory, the disorder of that name in man and in clothes was produced in much the same manner. (See the Dissertation prefixed to his Commentary on Leviticus.) There is another way of accounting for its connexion with human leprosy, which is, by supposing that the walls had taken a leprous contagion from man, and were in a condition, when really infected, to transmit it to men. In this case, the difficulty remains of understanding the details which are given of the appearances which the walls presented. There is also not a word said which can be construed to intimate that the house-leprosy was infectious to man; on the contrary, the direction to remove the furniture before the priest entered to inspect the house, lest it should partake in the sentence of uncleanness which he might see occasion to pronounce, is the very way best calculated to have propagated the leprous contagion, if any capable of being communicated to man had existed. Michaelis gives an explanation which seems more clearly to elucidate the subject than any other which has fallen under our notice, and the rejection of which seems to leave no other alternative than the acceptance of the rabbinical interpretation which we have mentioned. He observes that walls and houses are often attacked with something that corrodes and consumes them, and which is called by the Germans 'saltpetre,' but which we will call 'mural salt.' This mural incrustation, or efflorescence, chiefly appears in damp situations, in cellars and ground-floors, seldom extending to the upper stories of a house; and its effects are in many respects so injurious as to justify, and indeed to require, in some climates, the attention of a legislator. The appearances which such walls exhibit correspond very well with the description given in this chapter: the spots, indeed, are not often of a greenish or reddish hue, though they are sometimes met with of the latter color. The analogy is indeed in general so clear, that Michaelis says he had known more than one example of children who, shortly after reading the account here given of the house-leprosy, have come with terror to relate that they had discovered it on the walls of the cellar. They 'described it distinctly or figuratively to their parents, and were laughed at for their pains. Laughed at they certainly ought not to have been, but instructed. Their acute vision had shown them what many a learned man has in vain sought to find out.' The detrimental effects of this efflorescence are fully detailed by the same author ('Commentaries,' vol. iii. pp. 298–305). The following is the substance of his statement. The walls become mouldy, and that to such a degree, as, in consequence of the corrosion spreading farther and farther, at last to occasion their tumbling down. The plaster also requires frequent repairing, as it blisters, as it is called, that is, detaches itself from the wall, swells, and then falls off. The things that lie near the walls thus affected become damaged, and in the end spoiled. Books and other articles that cannot bear dampness and acids are often ruined from this cause. If this 'saltpetre' be strong in the occupied apartments, it is very injurious to health, particularly where people sleep

35 And he that owneth the house shall come and tell the priest, saying, It seemeth to me *there is* as it were [d] a plague in the house:

36 Then the priest shall command that they empty the house before the priest go *into it* to see the plague, that all that *is* in the house be not made unclean; and afterward the priest shall go in to see the house:

37 And he shall look on the plague, and behold, *if* the plague *be* in the walls of the house, with hollow streaks, greenish, or reddish, which in sight *are* lower than the wall;

38 Then the priest shall go out of the house to the door of the

[d] Ps. 91. 10. Prov. 3. 33. Zech. 5. 4.

---

near the wall. If such effects be experienced in modern Europe, there is room to conclude that they were more strongly exhibited at the early period under notice, and in countries where domestic architecture never attained much perfection, and where people generally live in houses having but one story. Taking this to be the 'house-leprosy' of the Scriptures, the object of the Mosaic ordinance is sufficiently intelligible.'—*Pict. Bib.*

35. *He that owneth the house shall come and tell the priest, saying, It seemeth to me there is as it were a plague in the house.* That is, the plague of leprosy. The owner, it seems, was to speak in a qualified and dubious manner, it being the office of the priest to pronounce a positive sentence on the subject. 'Although he be a wise man,' says Maimonides, 'and knoweth certainly that it is the plague, he may not determine and say, The plague appeareth to me in the house; but he shall say, It seemeth to me there is *as it were* the plague,' &c. The serious ultimate loss he might sustain rendered it the interest of the owner to give the earliest intimation on the subject, and to be attentive to the first indications of infection. If it gained ground, he not only lost his house, but probably his furniture, which we have no reason to conclude to have been removed previous to inspection, unless when early information came from the owner himself; and if the priest, on inspection, declared the house unclean, it is obvious that everything which remained in it became unclean also.

36. *And the priest shall command that they empty the house.* Heb. וּפִנּוּ *u-pinnu, and they shall prepare;* i. e. by removing all articles of furniture, and every thing that would prevent or impede the due examination of the premises.

37. *With hollow streaks.* This was in effect the same kind of criterion that was established for detecting the leprosy in the human body. If a spot was deeper than the skin of the flesh it was decidedly a bad symptom; so when these *hollow streaks* or rather *depressed cavities* appeared in the wall of a house, showing that corrosion had already taken place, it was a clear sign that it was a house-leprosy. The original word שְׁקַעֲרוּרֹת *shekaaruroth*, is a compound word with the import of *sunk* or *lowlying*, and here doubtless implies an effect on the stones which we should describe by the word *pitted*. The Gr. has κοιλάδες, *little hollows*, and the Vulg. 'valliculas,' *little vallies*. But the idea of *long streaks* or *creases*, conveyed by our translation, does not seem to be warranted by the original, nor does there appear to be any evidence that this kind of caries or gangrene in stones corroded them in *streaks*. It was rather, we may suppose, in *spots*.—¶ *Which in sight are lower than the wall.* That is, which are deeper than the surface of the wall.

38. *Then the priest shall go out of the house*, &c. The particularity with

house, and shut up the house seven days:

39 And the priest shall come again the seventh day, and shall look; and behold, *if* the plague be spread in the walls of the house;

40 Then the priest shall command that they take away the stones in which the plague *is*, and they shall cast them into an unclean place without the city:

41 And he shall cause the house to be scraped within round about, and they shall pour out the dust that they scrape off without the city into an unclean place:

42 And they shall take other stones, and put *them* in the place of those stones; and he shall take other mortar, and shall plaster the house.

43 And if the plague come again, and break out in the house, after that he hath taken away the stones, and after he hath scraped the house, and after it is plastered;

44 Then the priest shall come and look; and behold, *if* the plague be spread in the house, it *is* [e] a fretting leprosy in the house: it *is* unclean.

45 And he shall break down the house, the stones of it, and the timber thereof, and all the mortar of the house: and he shall carry *them* forth out of the city into an unclean place.

46 Moreover, he that goeth into the house all the while that it is shut up, shall be unclean until the even.

[e] ch. 13. 51. Zech. 5. 4.

---

which these circumstances are mentioned, doubtless implies that there was someting very formal in the manner of his pausing at the door, and ordering it to be effectually closed, that after the prescribed interval he might return and pronounce a more definite judgment. The plague would sooner appear in a vacant than in an occupied house.

40, 41. *That they take away the stones in which the plague is.* That is, as far as the leprous infection had extended in the walls. It is remarkable that the very same steps are requisite when a house in modern times is infected with the nitrous incrustration. The spot or stone which produces it must be absolutely removed; and the scraping and fresh plastering is also necessary. When any part of the walls impregnated with this substance is suffered to remain, it always effloresces anew, and beomes as bad as before. In large European buildings it is not indeed necessary to replaster the whole house, and the difference in this respect may be accounted for by the apparent smallness of the Hebrew houses.

43–45. *If the plague come again*, &c. It was possible that notwithstanding all the precautions thus ordered to be taken, their efforts might still be unavailing, and the taint of leprosy disclose itself in the walls of the house. Where this was the case, the only remaining alternative was utterly to demolish the building, and cast away the materials as abhorred and polluted rubbish, into some place equally unclean and abominable. A leprous house was not to be permitted to stand. The injury which such houses might do to the health of the inhabitants, or to the articles they contained, was of more consequence in the estimation of Moses than the buildings themselves. Those to whom this appears strange, and who lament the fate of a house pulled down by legal authority, probably think of large and magnificent houses like ours, of many stories high, which cost a great deal of money, and in the second story of which the people are generally secure from all danger of the saltpetre; but the houses of those days were low, and of very little value.

46, 47. *He that goeth into the house*, &c. The bare entering within the door

47 And he that lieth in the house shall wash his clothes: and he that eateth in the house shall wash his clothes.

48 And if the priest shall come in, and look *upon it*, and behold, the plague hath not spread in the house, after the house was plastered: then the priest shall pronounce the house clean, because the plague is healed.

49 And [f] he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop:

50 And he shall kill the one of the birds in an earthen vessel, over running water:

[f] ver. 4.

51 And he shall take the cedar-wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water, and sprinkle the house seven times:

52 And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird, and with the running water, and with the living bird, and with the cedar-wood, and with the hyssop, and with the scarlet:

53 But he shall let go the living bird out of the city into the open fields, and [g] make an atonement for the house: and it shall be clean.

[g] ver. 20.

of a suspected house, without making any stay there, incurred defilement, and imposed separation during the rest of the day. But one that ventured to lodge or eat in the house under these circumstances, as he was in more danger of bringing away the infection, was required to wash his clothes before he could enjoy his usual intercourse with the people. This was an ordinance well calculated to convey a moral admonition in respect to the duty of avoiding all suspected persons and places, or as the apostle terms it, of 'abstaining from the least appearance of evil.'

48–53. *The priest shall pronounce the house clean.* Heb. טהר *tihar, shall make clean.* Gr. καθαριεῖ, *shall purify.* That is, shall do this *declaratively*, as explained above, ch. 13. 3. The verdict thus pronounced was to be accompanied with the same offerings and rites of purification as in the case of leprous persons pronounced clean. 'The serious investigation which the matter had undergone, and this final and solemn declaration, that the house was clean, together with the offering made on the occasion, was well calculated to make the fact known, and to relieve the public mind from any anxiety which might be entertained concerning the spread of the house-leprosy, and at the same time to exonerate the proprietor from any inconvenience to which he might have been exposed from the unascertained suspicion that the infection was in his house. Michaelis extols the whole of this law concerning 'house-leprosy' exceedingly, under the view which he was led to take of it, and in which we have chiefly followed him; and although it is probably attended with less evil in Europe than in the East, he inclines to wish that some similar regulations operated in newly-built cities. It is, however, a remarkable fact that, so far from this being the case, the sovereigns of Germany, and probably also in other countries, did all in their power to encourage the mural incrustation when saltpetre became necessary in the manufacture of gunpowder. They established their right to the product of the incrustation, even in private houses, as a sovereign regale; and the collectors took care, in scraping it off periodically, to leave the roots (if we may so express it), to form the source of a future crop; and the inhabitants dared not extirpate it altogether. The collection came, in the end, to be farmed out by the sovereign; and the

54 This *is* the law for all manner of plague of leprosy, and [h] scall,
55 And for the [i] leprosy of a garment, [k] and of an house,

[h] ch. 13. 30. [i] ch. 13. 47. [k] ver. 34.

56 And [l] for a rising, and for a scab, and for a bright spot:
57 To [m] teach when *it is* unclean, and when *it is* clean: this *is* the law of leprosy.

[l] ch. 13. 2. [m] Deut. 24. 8. Ezek. 44. 23.

saltpetre regale altogether formed a most odious oppression, more bitterly complained of by the people than almost any other. On this point see Beckmann's 'Hist. of Inventions,' vol. ii. pp. 476—478; and Michaelis, vol. iii. p. 304.'—*Pict. Bib.*

57. *To teach when it is unclean and when it is clean.* That is, to teach the priest when to pronounce a person or house clean or unclean. Heb. לְהוֹרֹת בְּיוֹם הַטָּמֵא וּבְיוֹם הַטָּהֹר *lehoroth beyom hattamë u-beyom hattâhor, to teach in the day of the unclean and in the day of the clean.* 'Day' appears here to be used of the *things* or *transactions* that should occur in it. 'To teach in the day' of any thing, is to teach respecting the works or duties appropriated to that day or season. It is a Heb. idiom of which the full force cannot be very well expressed in any other language.

Remarks.—(2, 3.) 'He shall be brought unto the priest; and the priest shall go forth out of the camp,' &c. The ministers of righteousness are to be always ready to *meet* the returning penitent, who would fain be cleansed from the defilement of sin, or who hopes he has been, and welcome him back to the fold of Christ.

(4.) 'Then shall the priest command to take for him,' &c. A very remarkable difference marks the vast superiority of *our* great High Priest over the high priest of the Jews. The latter, being a mere man, and himself compassed with infirmity, could not *heal* the leper; he could only *discover* by inspection when he was already healed by God, and then by his office *declare* this to the people. He was then to perform the ceremonies appointed for his cleansing, and thus restore him again to society and to the privileges of God's house. But the Lord Jesus *heals* the leper. 'Lord, if thou wilt thou canst make me clean;' and Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him, and said, I will, be thou clean; and immediately his leprosy departed from him and he was cleansed.' To this great Physician, then, let us resort, to obtain that moral cleansing for which there is neither cure nor relief in any other quarter. Let us cry to him as did the leper, in the day of his flesh, 'Jesus, master, have mercy on us!' and God himself shall acknowledge and pronounce us clean. The hyssop is even now ready wherewith to sprinkle our souls. Let us use it by faith, and we shall experience with David its unfailing efficacy; 'Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.' But let us be sprinkled not once or twice only, but '*seven* times,' then shall we be 'washed *thoroughly* from our iniquity, and be cleansed from our sin.'

(9.) The leper did not come at once into the camp, after he had been pronounced clean, and sprinkled according to the ordinance. He was not admitted to his tent, or restored to society, till after living in some place alone for seven days more; and then after again washing his body and his clothes, and shaving off all his hair, even to his eyebrows, he was reinstated in all his former privileges and comforts. This was designed to remind us, that the infection of nature, the defiling effects of sin, still remain, even in those who are regenerate, and force upon us the necessity of a daily washing in Christ, in order to our perfect cleansing. It is only in

CHAPTER XV.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses and to Aaron, saying,
2 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, [a] When any man hath a running issue out of his flesh, *because of* his issue he *is* unclean.

[a] ch. 22. 4. Numb. 5. 2. 2 Sam. 3. 29 Matt. 9. 20. Mark 5. 25. Luke 8. 43.

3 And this shall be his uncleanness, in his issue: whether his

heaven that we can be pronounced fully delivered from our remaining corruptions. But there is, as it were, the short period of a single week before that event arrives, when we shall be introduced to our Father's house, to our eternal home. The intervening time must indeed be spent in humiliating and painful exercises, but those exercises are only preparing us for the richer enjoyment of the promised bliss.

(14.) The application of the blood and oil to the ear, the thumb, and the toe of the leper, seems to intimate that every member of the body, and every faculty of the soul, needs a *special* purification from guilt and corruption, and a *special* consecration in the renewed man to the service of God. The language of the solemn rite was virtually this: 'Now you are made clean, let all your faculties and powers be devoted to the service of God. Let your ears be open to the commands of God. Let the work of your hands be bestowed upon the business of your high calling, and the accomplishment of the divine will. Let your footsteps be ordered in his word.'

(15.) Neither the blood nor the oil were on any account to be omitted in the purification of the leper; nor can either of them be omitted in the restoration of our souls to God. The oil significantly shadowed forth the Holy Ghost as a spirit of sanctification. By the blood we are justified, and by the oil we are sanctified. And it is worthy of remark, that the order to the leper was, that the oil should be put *upon* the blood of the trespass-offering, hinting that the blood of Christ must *first* be applied for our justification, and that *then* the Spirit will be given for our sanctification. This is the more carefully to be observed, inasmuch as men are very prone to reverse this established order. We seek sanctification first, and then make our attainments a ground of justification. But our plea on this score will be rejected. We are 'justified *freely through grace*.'

CHAPTER XV.

Of various Personal Uncleannesses and Purifications.

2. *When any man hath a running out of his flesh.* Heb. כִּי יִהְיֶה זָב מִבְּשָׂרוֹ *ki yihyĕh zab mibbesâro, when he shall be flowing from his flesh.* Gr. ὡ εαν γενηται ρυσις εκ του σωματος αυτου, *to whomsoever there shall be an issue or flux from his body.* The term 'flesh' is undoubtedly here an euphemism, it being used in the same sense in which it occurs Gen. 17. 13, Ezek. 16. 26. As to the disease itself which is here mentioned, though usually expressed by the Gr. term γονορρεια, *gonorrhœa*, which has become familiar in English nosology, yet it is not certain that it was intended to designate the *bad infection* known by it in modern times. If it were, the disease probably existed in a much milder form than the virulent complaint so denominated among us, and which a retributive providence has made in general the inseparable consequent of guilty indulgence. But it is for the most part understood by the Jews of the natural seed-flux, which arises from debility of the spermatic organs.

3. *This shall be his uncleanness in his issue.* That is, in these things, which he goes on to specify, shall consist the uncleanness of the man who is

flesh run with his issue, or his flesh be stopped from his issue, it *is* his uncleanness.

4 Every bed whereon he lieth that hath the issue, is unclean: and every thing whereon he sitteth, shall be unclean.

5 And whosoever toucheth his bed, shall wash his clothes, [b] and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

6 And he that sitteth on *any* thing whereon he sat that hath the issue, shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

7 And he that toucheth the flesh of him that hath the issue, shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

8 And if he that hath the issue spit upon him that is clean; then he shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

9 And what saddle soever he rideth upon that hath the issue, shall be unclean.

10 And whosoever toucheth any thing that was under him, shall be unclean until the even: and he that beareth *any of* those things, shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

11 And whomsoever he toucheth that hath the issue (and hath nót rinsed his hands in water) he shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

12 And the [c] vessel of earth that he toucheth which hath the issue, shall be broken: and every vessel of wood shall be rinsed in water.

[b] ch. 11. 25, and 17. 15.

[c] ch. 6. 28, and 11. 32, 33.

affected by gonorrhæa.——¶ *Or his flesh be stopped from his issue.* That is, clogged, obstructed, so as to prevent, by its thickening, a free and easy emission. In either of the cases mentioned the man was made unclean, and communicated his defilement to the beds, benches, &c., with which he came in contact, and through them to any one who might chance to sit or lie upon them, so that he was required to bathe himself in water and wash his clothes, and be considered unclean till evening.

12. *The vessel of earth—shall be broken; and every vessel of wood shall be rinsed in water.* A similar command as to earthen vessels, is given ch. 6. 38, where it is also directed that vessels of brass should be scoured. Michaelis asks why earthen vessels could not be as well cleansed by washing as those of wood or copper. In reply to this, Mr. Kitto says:—'Without entering into the question as to the art of glazing earthenware, it is our strong impression that the earthen vessels which Moses directed to be broken were not glazed. It is evident that glazed vessels may be as well or better cleansed from every impurity, by washing, than hard wood, or even copper; whereas unglazed vessels, from their porous nature, would receive a more permanent taint from any accidental defilement than either. Indeed, we would venture to be more definite, and point to a sort of pottery, which escaped the notice of Michaelis, as most probably that to which the direction may be understood with peculiar propriety to apply. In Egypt and Western Asia, the inhabitants have, in common use, vessels of porous clay, lightly baked, and rather thin in proportion to the size of the vessel. They are exclusively used for the purifying and cooling of water. The water constantly oozes through the minute pores of the vessel, forming a thick dew or moisture on the outer surface, the rapid evaporation of which reduces the temperature of the vessel, and of the water it contains, much below that of the at-

13 And when he that hath an issue is cleansed of his issue; then [d] he shall number to himself seven days for his cleansing, and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water, and shall be clean.

14 And on the eighth day he shall take to him [e] two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, and come before the LORD, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and give them unto the priest:

15 And the priest shall offer them, [f] the one *for* a sin-offering, and the other *for* a burnt-offering; [g] and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the LORD for his issue.

16 And [h] if any man's seed of copulation go out from him, then he shall wash all his flesh in water, and be unclean until the even.

17 And every garment, and every

[d] ver. 28. ch. 14. 8. [e] ch. 14. 22, 23 [f] ch. 14. 30, 31. [g] ch. 14. 19, 31. [h] ch. 22. 4. Deut. 23. 10.

mosphere; by which means the inhabitants are enabled to obtain, in the warmest weather, water perfectly cool for drink. The water, as it passes through, is filtered to the most perfect clearness; and, for family use, there are large vessels of this sort, propped upon frames of wood, with other vessels of similar clay, but different form, placed underneath to receive the filtered water that drops from the outer surface of the other. Thus a supply of water, perfectly clear and refreshingly cool, is at once secured. Jugs of various sizes, and elegant but fragile drinking-cups, of the same clay, are also employed to keep the filtered water cool while at hand for occasional use, and while being actually used. Now the manufacture of these percolating vessels originated in Egypt in very ancient times, and they are still made there in great perfection. If the invention ascends to the time of Moses, there can be no question that the Israelites were acquainted with the art of making them, and would questionless use them for the purpose of purifying and refrigerating the generally bad water of the deserts through which they wandered; and as they had vessels of wood and copper for other purposes, it is not too much to suppose that their earthen vessels were almost exclusively of this description; for to this day a wandering people do not like to encumber themselves with numerous earthen vessels, which are so liable to be broken in their removals. Assuming, then, that such were their vessels,—the direction to break them when defiled is easy to be understood, because, from their remarkably porous nature, whatever spot, stain, or other impurity they receive, is at once absorbed into their mass, either immediately or through the agency of the water, and it becomes impossible to cleanse them entirely by any common process. In fact, we have with our own hands broken many jugs and drinking-cups of this description, when they received some accidental contamination, from the spontaneous feeling that they had become wholly defiled, and could not be cleansed. It seems to us that the explanation we have here given will account more satisfactorily than any other for the distinction which has occasioned so much perplexity to Michaelis and other commentators. Similar usages to those which the text inculcates, as to the treatment of defiled vessels, prevailed among the ancient Egyptians, and still do so among the Mohammedans and Hindoos.'—*P. Bib.*

13. *Then shall he number to himself seven days*, &c. During this time he was to keep himself secluded by way of testing the completeness of his cure; and if the issue ceased entirely for that whole week, he was then to consider himself so far clean as to be entitled to offer the following sacrifices as an atonement for having been legally unclean.

skin whereon is the seed of copulation, shall be washed with water, and be unclean until the even.

18 The woman also with whom man shall lie *with* seed of copulation, they shall *both* bathe *themselves* in water, and [i] be unclean until the even.

19 ¶ And [k] if a woman have an issue, *and* her issue in her flesh be blood, she shall be put apart seven days: and whosoever toucheth her shall be unclean until the even.

20 And every thing that she lieth upon in her separation shall be unclean; every thing also that she sitteth upon shall be unclean.

21 And whosoever toucheth her bed shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

22 And whosoever toucheth any thing that she sat upon shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

23 And if it *be* on *her* bed, or on any thing whereon she sitteth, when he toucheth it he shall be unclean until the even.

24 And [l] if any man lie with her at all, and her flowers be upon him, he shall be unclean seven days: and all the bed whereon he lieth shall be unclean.

25 And if [m] a woman have an issue of her blood many days out of the time of her separation, or if it run beyond the time of her separation; all the days of the issue of her uncleanness shall be as the days of her separation; she *shall be* unclean.

26 Every bed whereon she lieth all the days of her issue shall be unto her as the bed of her separation: and whatsoever she sitteth upon shall be unclean, as the uncleanness of her separation.

27 And whosoever toucheth those things shall be unclean, and shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.

28 But [n] if she be cleansed of her issue, then she shall number to herself seven days, and after that she shall be clean.

29 And on the eighth day she shall take unto her two turtles, or two young pigeons, and bring them unto the priest, to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

30 And the priest shall offer the one *for* a sin-offering, and the other *for* a burnt-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for her before the LORD for the issue of her uncleanness.

31 Thus shall ye [o] separate the children of Israel from their un-

[i] 1 Sam. 21. 4. [k] ch. 12. 2. [l] See ch. 20. 18.

[m] Matt. 9. 20. Mark 5. 25. Luke 8. 43. [n] ver. 13. [o] ch. 11. 47. Deut. 24. 8. Ezek. 44. 23.

18. *The woman also with whom man shall lie*, &c. The sense of this verse is somewhat doubtful, but, as it should seem, it refers to the preceding verses, viz. the wife, also, in case that should happen which is mentioned v. 16, 17, shall bathe and be unclean till evening.

24. *And if any man lie with her*, &c. That is, without knowing her to be in that condition; for if it was done knowingly, both were liable to the punishment of death. Lev. 20. 8. Comp. Lev. 18. 19. See also Ezek. 22. 10.

25. *And if a woman have an issue of her blood*, &c. This refers not to any thing *natural* or *ordinary*, but to a chronic, morbid issue, constituting the disease of which mention is made in the gospel, Mat. 9. 20, where a woman 'which was diseased with an *issue of blood* twelve years,' is said to have come behind the Savior and touched the hem of his garment, and was made whole.

31. *Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness.*

cleanness: that they die not in their uncleanness, when they [p] defile my tabernacle that *is* among them.

32 [q] This *is* the law of him that hath an issue, [r] and *of him* whose seed goeth from him, and is defiled therewith;

33 [s] And of her that is sick of her flowers, and of him that hath an issue, of the man, [t] and of the woman, [u] and of him that lieth with her that is unclean.

[p] Numb. 5. 3, and 19. 13, 20. Ezek. 5. 11, and 23. 38. [q] ver. 2. [r] ver. 16.

[s] ver. 19. [t] ver. 25. [u] ver 24.

Heb. הזרתם *hizzartem*, from the root נזר *nâzar*, *to separate*, from which comes 'Nazarite,' applied to one who was peculiarly *separated* and *sanctified* to the Lord. The use of the term plainly implies that the people of Israel, by their abstinence from every thing forbidden, and by their rigid observance of all these ordinances, were to demean themselves before God *as a nation of Nazarites*. The Gr. has ευλαβεις ποιησετε, *ye shall make devoutly wary*.——¶ *When they defile my tabernacle that is among them*. Heb. בטמאם *betammeâm*, *in their defiling*. It is clear from this, that one special design of these enactments was to secure a becoming degree of reverence for the Tabernacle. This was the seat and throne of the divine glory, and nothing was to be allowed within its precincts which would go to lower the general estimate of the purity and sanctity which God would have attached to the place of his peculiar residence. Comp. Jer. 2. 23, and 7. 30; Ezek. 5. 11,—14. 11,—22. 3, 4,—37. 23.

32. *This is the law of him that hath an issue.* 'We may conclude our remarks upon these chapters relating to contagious disorders, and acts causing ceremonial uncleanness, by directing attention to the admirable regulations for preventing contagion. The subject is now almost entirely overlooked in the East, except so far as regards some regulations concerning lepers, which appear to have been derived from those now before us. We are unacquainted with any Oriental nations, ancient or modern, which had a sanatory code in the slightest degree comparable to this, which is indeed scarcely equalled by the regulations of the best European lazarettos. We have been eye-witnesses of the fearful consequences which proceed in Asiatic countries from the absence of any measures to prevent the spread of contagious disorders. In Mohammedan Asia this may be partly owing to the medical doctrine of Mohammed, who, in his ignorant self-sufficiency, undertook, according to one of the received traditions, to declare that diseases were not contagious. This dictum had its weight, although it was contrary to the received opinions of his time, for, as the Arabian commentator remarks, 'It was a belief of the people of ignorance, that any one sitting near a diseased person, or eating with one, would take his disease.' (*Mischat-ul-Masabih*. Calcutta, 1810.) It is true that he seems to direct the avoidance of intercourse with a person laboring under the elephantiasis—but this is a solitary exception to his general rule. Mohammed has adopted from the chapter before us, and other parts of the Pentateuch, the laws relating to ceremonial uncleanness, and has added many others of his own. But there is this difference in the result, that uncleanness under his law does not generally extend beyond the time when the unclean persons bathe and wash any defiling stain from their clothes. There are some exceptions, chiefly relative to females, in which the consequences of defilement more nearly coincide with those of the Levitical law.'—*Pict. Bib.*

CHAPTER XVI.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

The proper place of this chapter, as appears from v. 1, would have been immediately after the tenth; but the death of Aaron's two sons, for their profane conduct in the discharge of their office as priests, gave occasion to the enactment of the above cited laws respecting the various uncleannesses which disqualified an Israelite for approaching the sanctuary. Those ordinances having been dispatched in the five preceding chapters, the regular thread of the sacred record is now resumed, and Moses goes on to give directions concerning the great national festival of atonement in its various details.

This is called by the sacred writer יום הכפורים *yom hakkippurim, day of expiations or atonements*, and by the modern Jews כפור *kippur*. It was so called from its having been instituted for the expiation of all the sins, irreverences, and pollutions of all the Israelites, from the highest priest to the lowest people, committed by them throughout the year. It was observed on the tenth day of the seventh month, or Tisri, corresponding to a part of our September. It was one of the most important and interesting days in the whole Jewish calendar; and though called occasionally the 'feast of expiation,' yet its genuine character was rather that of a fast—a day for 'afflicting their souls,'—and is only called 'feast' in the sense of a *set solemnity*. It is the day alluded to, Acts 27. 9: 'Now when much time was spent, and when sailing was now dangerous, because *the fast was now already past*, Paul admonished them,' &c. It was in all its services and ceremonies the fullest representation, the most perfect shadow, of the great work of redemption; the high priest prefiguring, in all he did, that which Christ, in the fullness of times, was ordained to do. On this account a somewhat minute notice of the observances of the day may be proper in this connexion.

Of so much sacredness was this solemnity regarded, that the people began their preparation for it seven days before, by removing the high priest from his own house to a chamber in the temple, (after the temple was built), lest he should contract such a pollution from any of his family, as might incur a seven days' uncleanness, and thereby unfit him for performing his pontifical duties. On the third and seventh of these days, he was besprinkled with the ashes of the red heifer, lest he might inadvertently have been defiled by a dead body. On the morning of the day before that of the atonement, they brought him to the east gate of the court of the Gentiles, where they made bullocks, and rams, and lambs to pass before him, that he might be the better able to make the proper selection; and on every day of the seven they caused him to sprinkle the blood of the daily sacrifice, to burn the parts of it upon the altar, to offer the incense, and to trim the lamps, that he might be the more familiar with these offices, when called to perform them. He was moreover committed, for a part of each of the days, to some of the elders of the Sanhedrim, who read to him the rites of the day in order to make sure of his going rightly through the rubric. He was then conducted into the chamber of incense that he might learn to handle the incense, and to take an oath as to the mode of burning it when he entered into the holiest of all. Their words on the occasion were as follows:—'High priest, we are the messengers of the Sanhedrim, and thou art our messenger, and that of the Sanhedrim; we adjure thee by Him that caused his name to dwell in this house, that thou alter not any thing of what we have spoken unto thee.' The reason of this solemn adjuration was, that a Sadducee, in contempt of the written word, and of their traditions, at one time had dared to kindle the incense

without the vail, and to carry it smoking within; whereas he ought not to have kindled it till within the vail. During the night that preceded the grand solemnity, he was required to eat but sparingly, though he was to fast the whole of the next day, for fear that he might become drowsy, and thus desecrate in some measure the services of the day. This entire night was spent in his expounding, or hearing expounded to him, the written law.

The day having at length arrived, the high priest laid aside his ordinary dress, bathed himself the first time, and put on the rich garments peculiar to his office. Habited with these, he instantly went into the court of the priests, went to the laver according to priestly usage, to wash his hands and his feet for the first time; proceeded thence to the north side of the altar, to kill the morning sacrifice; ascended the altar with the several pieces, and laid them on the fire; went into the holy place to trim the lamp and offer the incense; blessed the people on the top of the steps of the porch; and in short did all that belonged to the ordinary morning service.

Having finished this part of his duty, the next thing was to solemnize his own mind and the people's by some previous sacrifices. These, in Num. 29. 8–11, are said to be as follows:—a bullock, a ram, and seven lambs for a burnt-offering, with their appropriate meal-offerings; and a kid of the goats for a sin-offering. When he had finished these, he washed his hands and feet a second time at the laver. He then retired to a particular chamber of the temple, and proceeded to strip himself of his rich habiliments, to bathe himself in water a second time, and to put on his plain white linen vestments, the same dress as that worn by the common priests, except that he had the sacerdotal mitre on his head. Thus attired, he proceeded to the work of sacrifice. Going up to the bullock, and standing with his face towards the temple, he laid both his hands on the head of the animal, and solemnly pronounced the following words: 'O Lord, I have sinned, done perversely, and transgressed before thee, I and my house. I beseech thee, O Lord, expiate the sins, perversities, and transgressions whereby I have sinned, done perversely, and transgressed, I and my house, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant, saying, For in this day he will expiate for you, to purge you from all your sins before the Lord, that ye may be clean;' referring to v. 30, where these words are to be found.

Having made this confession, he went to the north-east corner of the court, where the two kids of the goats, intended for the congregation, were ordained to stand. There he cast lots for the two goats, by means of two pieces of gold, put into a box called קַלְפִּי *kelphi*, on one of which was written לַיהוָה *laihovah*, *for the Lord*, and on the other לַעֲזָאזֵל *le-azazel*, *for Azazel*, rendered in our version, 'for the scape-goat,' in relation to which an extended discussion will be found in the ensuing notes. He then proceeded to slay the bullock for his own sins, and the goat upon which the lot had fallen to be sacrificed to the Lord; after which he filled a censer with burning coals from the altar, and putting two handfuls of incense into a vase, he bore them into the holy of holies. Having here poured the incense upon the coals, he returned, took the blood of the bullock and the goat, and went again into the most holy place. With his finger he first sprinkled the blood of the bullock, and afterwards of the goat, upon the lid of the ark of the covenant, and seven times also he sprinkled it upon the floor before the ark. He then returned from the most holy into the holy place, and besmeared the horns of the golden altar with the blood of the bullock and the goat, and jetted the blood seven times over the surface of the altar.

The next duty of the high priest was

CHAPTER XVI.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses after [a] the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they offered before the LORD, and died:

2 And the LORD said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he [b] come not at all times into the holy *place* within the vail, before the mercy-seat, which *is* upon the ark; that he die not: for [c] I will

[a] ch. 10. 1, 2.

[b] Exod. 30. 10. ch. 23. 27. Heb. 9. 7, and 10. 19. [c] Exod. 25. 22, and 40. 34. 1 Kings 8. 10, 11, 12.

to make an atonement for the holy place, for the tabernacle, and for the altar. This was done by sprinkling the blood of the bullock and the blood of the goat, each right before the vail, and then by mingling them together and sprinkling the horns and the body of the golden altar of incense.

We are now come, in the order of the ceremonies, to the scape-goat, which was to be sent away into the wilderness. To this animal as he stood in the court of the priests, the high-priest approached, and laying both hands upon its head, which was bound around with a scarlet thread, made over it a solemn confession of the sins of the people of Israel, after which it was consigned to the hands of a person especially appointed to conduct it to some desert and desolate region, where it was allowed an unmolested escape. The mystical or typical design of this transaction will be found fully considered in a subsequent note. The Jewish writers detail a multitude of additional ceremonies connected with the dismission of the scape-goat, but as they are obviously of a fabulous cast, we waive entirely the recital of them.

After the sending away of the emissary goat, the high priest put off his white vestments, and assuming his splendid robes, sacrificed a holocaust for himself and the people, and then offered another sin-offering. The Jews assert that he then went a *third* time into the holy of holies for the purpose of bringing away the censer; but this is not certain, as he might have taken it when he returned the second time for the blood. However this may be, he proceeded afterwards to wash his hands and feet at the laver, after which he went to the dressing-chamber, that he might lay aside his linen suit, bathe himself for the last time, and resume his rich official dress, in which to offer the evening incense and trim the lamps on the golden candlestick. All this done, he washed his hands and feet at the laver for the last time; went to the dressing-chamber; laid aside his rich attire; resumed his ordinary wearing apparel; and retired to his own house accompanied by the multitude, rejoicing that God had not mingled his blood with his sacrifice.

Directions to the High Priest as to entering into the Holy Place.

2. *Speak unto Aaron thy brother that he come not at all times into the holy place within the vail.* That is, within the vail separating the holy from the most holy place, of which see an account, Ex. 26. 33. Into the holy place *without* the vail, the officiating priests were to enter every day, morning and evening, in the performance of their functions; but they were to know that the greatest possible sanctity attached to the inner room, and as none of the common priests were ever to enter this apartment at all, so neither was the high priest to do it at all times, but only on the particular occasion here specified. It is generally supposed, however, that this rule did not preclude his entrance into the holy of holies to consult the oracle on extraordinary and pressing occasions, which concerned the national welfare, as for instance in the case mentioned, Judg. 1. 1,—20. 18. Comp.

appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat.

3 Thus shall Aaron [d] come into the holy *place:* [e] with a young bullock for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering.

4 He shall put on [f] the holy linen coat, and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with a linen girdle, and with the linen mitre shall he be attired: these *are* holy garments; therefore [g] shall he wash his flesh in water, and *so* put them on.

[d] Heb. 9. 7, 12, 24, 25. [e] ch. 4. 3. [f] Exod. 28. 39, 42, 43. ch. 6. 10. Ezek. 44. 17, 18.

[g] Exod. 30. 20. ch. 8. 6, 7.

Num. 27. 21. This order was given to Aaron, not merely in his personal capacity, but as the representative of all those who should sustain in after ages the same office.——¶ *For I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat.* Targ. Jon. 'The glory of my Shekinah shall be revealed.' The allusion is to the bright luminous cloud which took its station over the mercy-seat, and between the cherubims, and constituted the standing symbol of the divine presence. Others, however, understand it of the *cloud of incense* mentioned v. 13. But this is less likely, for in that case we might properly ask, *what then was to be seen?* It is plainly a promise that something should be made *visible* on the occasion referred to; and though we admit there was a cloud of incense filling the inner sanctuary, yet it is declared that something should be seen over the mercy-seat, and what was this but the luminous symbol of the divine presence? The cloud of incense would no doubt serve to soften the splendor of the Shekinah, and make the view tolerable to the eyes of the high priest; and it will be observed throughout the Scriptures, that the accompaniment of a cloud is generally spoken of in connexion with the manifestation of the visible divine glory. In like manner, when the future coming of Christ, the substance of the Shekinah, is announced, it is said that he shall come 'in clouds,' 'in the clouds of heaven,' &c. Dan. 7. 13, Rev. 1. 7. The note of Rosenmuller on the passage before us will be found very important. See also *Vitringa's Observ. Sac.*, l. 1., c. 11.

3. *Thus shall Aaron come into the holy* place, &c. Heb. רבא אל קדש *yâbo el kodesh*, which may be rendered, *approach to the holy*, i. e. enter upon or engage in the performance of his holy duties. At the same time, as the original word is in many instances applied to the tabernacle or temple, it may here have that sense, as it was *at* the tabernacle that these rites were to be performed. But we are not to understand that these offerings were to be brought *into* the holy place, which might possibly be inferred from the use of this preposition. 'To' would be a preferable rendering of the Heb. אל *el*. The *bullock* was to be presented as a *sin-offering* for himself, his family, and the whole Levitical priesthood. The *ram* for a *burnt-offering*, to signify that he and his associates were *wholly consecrated* to, and to be *wholly employed* in, the work of the ministry. The ceremonies with which these two sacrifices were accompanied, are detailed in the following verses.

4. *He shall put on the holy linen coat,* &c. Heb. כתנת בד קדש *ketoneth bad kodesh, the linen tunic of holiness.* Gr. χιτωνα λινουν ἡγιασμενον, *the sanctified linen coat.* See this described in the Note on Ex. 28. 39. There were eight different garments belonging to the altar of the high priest, four of which, called by the Jews 'the white garments,' and made wholly of linen, are here mentioned as to be worn on this day. The remaining four which are mentioned Ex. 28. 4, were called 'the golden garments,' from there being a mixture of gold in them. Inasmuch as the day of

5 And he shall take of [h] the congregation of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin-offering, and one ram for a burnt-offering.

6 And Aaron shall offer his bullock of the sin-offering, which *is* for himself, and [i] make an atonement for himself, and for his house.

7 And he shall take the two goats, and present them before the LORD *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

8 And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the LORD, and the other lot for the scape-goat.

[h] See ch. 4. 14. Numb. 29. 11. 2 Chron. 29. 21. Ezra 6. 17. Ezek. 45. 22, 23. [i] ch. 9. 7. Heb. 5. 2, and 7. 27, 28, and 9. 7.

atonement was a day of sorrow, humiliation, and repentance, the high priest was not to be clad in his rich pontifical robes, but in the simple sacerdotal vestments which were thought to be more appropriate to this occasion. Both the priest and the people were to be reminded, that when he appeared to confess and to expiate their sins and his own, he ought to be clothed in the garments of humility, for in the character of sinners, the highest and the lowest were upon a level before God. These garments, however, were to be put off in the after part of the day, and the ordinary attire of his office resumed, vv. 23, 24.

5. *He shall take of the congregation two kids of the goats.* As the former sacrifices were for himself, so these were for the congregation at large, who were hereby significantly taught to regard themselves as sinners having equal need of the benefits of the blood of atonement to give them acceptance before God.

6. *And Aaron shall offer his bullock,* &c. That is, shall present with a view to its being offered, for the actual oblation is described v. 11. This presentation of the victim was accompanied with a solemn supplicatory prayer, the form of which is given in our preliminary remarks.——¶ *And for his house.* Chal. 'For the men of his house.' By this we are probably to understand not merely the private household of the priest, but also the whole body of inferior priests and Levites.

7. *And he shall take the two goats and present them,* &c. Heb. והעמיד *he'emid, make to stand.* Gr. στησει, *shall station.* These goats, the Rabbins say, were to be taken from the same flock, to be of equal stature, of the same color, and of the same value; in a word, complete counterparts of each other as far as practicable.——¶ *At the door of the tabernacle.* Within the court-yard, as we have previously shown. See Note on Lev. 8. 3.

8. *And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats.* According to the Jews, the two lots might be either of wood, stone, or metal. On one was written *for Jehovah,* and on the other *for the scape-goat.* They were then put into a vessel, while the goats stood with their faces to the west. The vessel was then shaken, and the priest putting in both his hands, brought out a lot in each. Being stationed between the two goats, the lot which was on his right hand he laid upon the goat that was on his right; and that which was in his left hand he laid upon the goat that was on his left; and thus according to what was written on the lots, the *scape goat* and the *goat for sacrifice* were determined.

AZAZEL, OR THE SCAPE-GOAT.

If there be any thing calculated to diminish the pleasure or damp the ardor of the Biblical expositor in his researches, it is the stern necessity under which he sometimes finds himself placed, of putting new interpretations upon familiar texts. The deeper he penetrates into the mine of Scriptural wealth, and

the wider the excavation which he makes on either hand, the greater is the probability of his here and there undermining the adjacent surface and causing it occasionally to fall in. But this will be little to be regretted if the chasms thus made only open new avenues to treasures below vastly more precious than any which had lain above. Still it is always more or less painful to an ingenuous mind to disturb, in any degree, a 'throned opinion,' even though that opinion be founded in error, and he be able to substitute in place of it an irrefragable truth. Knowing with what fond tenacity men cling to their ancient and accredited forms of belief, he does not like rudely to assail them, and it is only a very rampant spirit of innovation that can take delight in breaking up the time-hallowed associations with which certain phrases and sentences of holy writ uniformly come before the mind. Yet it is certain that this result is in many cases absolutely inevitable. It is the invariable law of human progress, whether in the department of nature or revelation, that as the light breaks forth upon our previous darkness, new modifications should come over established ideas. It would therefore be the height of injustice to ascribe, in all cases, to a rage of novelty in those who suggest them, the new interpretations which an advanced state of science or philology, or a more extended and critical inter-collation of passages, may force upon their convictions. It is to be remembered that they too have known what it is to be wedded to favorite interpretations, and can tell of the struggle which it cost them to give them up. But they yielded to the force of evidence, and embraced the views which, it may be, they at first strenuously withstood. If then they become the patrons of these views, and with all the requisite array of learning and logic, endeavor to make good their access to other minds, let it be presumed it is not owing merely to a prurient prompting to obtrude a novel exposition upon the mind of the Christian community, but to the stern behests of the spirit of homage to truth, which will not let them forbear to utter what they sincerely and solemnly believe to be the sense of revelation.

These remarks will no doubt be perceived to have a direct and prominent bearing upon the task which we have imposed upon ourselves, in the somewhat elaborate investigation of the subject which now comes before us.—The typical institution of the Scapegoat is one of the most striking features of the Levitical system, and its import as a symbol has been so long rested in as shadowing forth the grand doctrine of the economical transfer of sin and guilt from believers to Christ, that one would almost as soon think of doubting the *fact* of such a ceremony, as of calling in question the established sense which common theological consent has attached to it. Indeed, it has been remarked, that while other types receive light from their accomplishment in Christ, this is intrinsically so apt, so felicitous, so obvious, that it reflects light upon the gospel itself. The imposition of hands and the confession of sins on the head of the emissary goat, and his subsequent discharge and escape into the wilderness, seem to afford so fit an emblem of the bearing and carrying away of the sins of believers by the substituted divine victim, that it would appear to be no less a violence done to the pious sentiments, than to the pondering reason, of the Christian, to attempt to divert the spiritual application of the symbol to any other subject. But fealty to truth must predominate over every other sentiment in the bosom of the humble disciple of revelation. Under its guidance we are to shrink from no results to which we are legitimately brought. And in this spirit of supreme deference to the dictates of truth, we would enter upon the critical exposition of the passage before us.

The following is the correct rendering of the verse:—'And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot לַיהוָה *lai-hovah, for Jehovah*, and the other lot לַעֲזָאזֵל *la-azazel, for Azazel.*' The goat on which the lot of Jehovah fell was to be brought and offered up for a sin-offering, but the goat on which the lot of Azazel fell was to be 'presented alive before Jehovah to make an atonement with him (עָלָיו *alauv, upon or over him*), to let it go for Azazel into the wilderness.' Of the former, the blood was to be carried within the vail, and to be sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat, in order that atonement might be made for the holy place because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel. When on the other hand the live goat was brought, the high priest was to lay both his hands upon its head and to confess over it all the iniquities of the children of Israel, putting them upon the head of the goat; after which he was to send it by the hand of a 'fit man' (אִישׁ אִתִּי *ish itti*) that it might bear upon it all their iniquities into a land not inhabited.

Such was the ceremony, and we are now to endeavor to ascertain its typical or symbolical scope, and especially what is to be understood by the different treatment of the two goats. But in order to do this, we must in the outset institute a careful inquiry into the meaning of the remarkable term 'Azazel,' which occurs in this connexion for the first and last time, and on the true sense of which it is evident that every thing depends.

Etymology and Meaning of the term Azazel.

To the eye of the Hebrew scholar, this word presents itself at once as a compound, but its constituent elements, and consequently its true significancy, have long been the theme of learned debate. Nearly every critical commentator opens his peculiar scholium upon the text, with a kind of preliminary groan of 'locus vexatissimus!' and some are disposed to give it up in despair. Bochart, whose stupendous erudition is seldom baffled by the most formidable difficulties, is here forced to the humble confession—'Me de hac voce עֲזָאזֵל *Azazel* nihil habere satis certum, *I have nothing certain to offer in regard to this word*;' and moreover that—'prudentiores vocem Hebræam relinquunt ἀνερμενεύτον,' *the more prudent leave the Hebrew word uninterpreted.* Under these circumstances it can be little discredit for one to fail of entire success in his attempts to illustrate the genuine import of the term. The failure of our predecessors affords us a kind of *testudinal* panoply against the shame of a like result.

We shall first state the principal explanations which have been given of the term.

I. Several of the Rabbinical writers, including the Targumists, understand by עֲזָאזֵל *Azazel*, the name of *the place* to which the scape-goat was conducted. Thus Jonathan, in his Targum on v. 10 of this chapter, renders the last clause—'to send him away to death *in a rough and rocky place* in the desert of Tsûk.' Here it was supposed by the Talmudists, that the goat was thrown down a steep precipice of the mountain called *Azazel*, and dashed to pieces. (Lightfoot Temp. Ser. p. 177, vol. IX. Pitman's Ed.) This is favored by the Arabic versions which have for the Hebrew לַעֲזָאזֵל *to Azazel*, every where לגבל אל עזאז *legebel al-azaz, to the Mount Azaz, or to the rough mountain*, as *azaz* properly signifies. And to give still more color to this interpretation, R. Saadias Gaon supposes the word to be compounded of אֵל *ël* and עָזַז *azaz*, so that the mountain עזאזל *Azazel*, is by transposition equivalent to עזזאל *Azzazel*, i. e. *rough mountain of God*, just as David, Ps. 36. 7, speaks of lofty mountains, as 'mountains of God.' But to say nothing of the license of alteration which appears in these readings.

we find no intimation of any mountain thus denominated, either in Palestine or out of it, to which the scape-goat was led. We are simply informed that the animal was to be conveyed into the wilderness, without any specification of the place. Besides, had Moses intended to have designated a particular mountain, he would doubtless have employed the common adjection 'Mount,' and we should have had 'Mount Azazel' just as we now have 'Mount Horeb,' 'Mount Ebal,' 'Mount Gerizim,' &c. Rejecting this interpretation therefore as untenable, we come upon another which unites the suffrages of a large class of the more modern commentators.

II. This supposes that the term עזאזל *Azazel* is the name, not of a *mountain* or *place*, but of *the scape-goat itself*. This, it is contended, is obvious from the structure of the word, taken in connexion with the structure of the sentence:—'Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for the Lord,' i. e. for the goat which was to be sacrificed to the Lord: 'and the other lot for Azazel,' i. e. for the goat which was to be sent away into the wilderness. The word itself, it is maintained, is easily and legitimately resolved into עז *ĕz*, *a goat*, and אזל *âzal*, *to go away*, *to depart*, which gives us the exact idea of the ceremonial use of the scape-goat, viz., that of being formally *sent away* into the wilderness. The rendering of several of the ancient versions gives, it is said, not a little confirmation to this sense of the term. Symmachus has for 'Azazel,' τραγος απερχόμενος, *the departing goat;* Aquila τραγος ἀπολελυμένος, *the goat set free or let loose;* and the Sept. ὁ ἀποπομπαῖος, which Theodoret and some other of the Greek fathers interpret as equivalent to ἀποπεμπόμενος, *sent away*. But as we shall show in the sequel that there is great reason to question the correctness of this interpretation, the rendering of the LXX must be taken here as important rather for the sense which has been put upon it, than for its own direct and positive testimony to the meaning of the Hebrew original.

The terms, however, above quoted are freely used by the ancient Greek writers, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, and others, in reference to the same subject, and the Latin vulgate accords with them by adopting the rendering, 'hircus emissarius,' *the emissary goat*. Guided by the same authorities, our translators have rendered the original by 'scape-goat.' But to this view of the origin and import of the Hebrew term, it must be admitted that there are serious objections, among which are the following.

(1.) It does not appear why such a singular and anomalous term should have been employed to express an idea so simple as that of *a goat sent away*. The Hebrew has an appropriate word for the subject, viz., עז *ĕz*, or שעיר *sâir*, *goat*, and another משלח *meshulla'h*, from שלח *shâla'h*, *to dismiss*, or *send away*, for the predicate. Why then should such a strange compound word be introduced in this connexion, especially when it is well known, that although, in Hebrew, proper names are often compounded, yet appellatives very seldom are? The presumption, from the genius of the language, is most unquestionably in favor of 'Azazel's' being a proper name. The force of this objection is greatly enhanced by the fact, that neither Onkelos, Jonathan, nor the Samaritan, have attempted to translate or paraphrase the term, which they undoubtedly would have done, had they considered it merely as an appellative.

(2.) It is objected to this explication by Bochart, that it involves a grammatical anomaly. Each of the goats was obviously required to be *a male;* but עז *ĕz*, in the sense of *goat*, more appropriately signifies *a female;* and yet it is here represented as compounded with the masculine אזל *azal*. We do not indeed consider this objection as insuperable, as there is some reason to ran

עז *ĕz* among the epicene or hermaphrodite nouns; but we may still say that we should more naturally have expected, that for the purpose intended, the unambiguous שעיראזל *Seïrazel* would have been employed, especially as שעירם *Seïrim*, is used in speaking of the two *goats* in the words immediately preceding.

(3.) But a far more serious difficulty incumbers the proposed interpretation, from the structure of the sentence. The direction in the text is thus worded:—'One lot shall be לירהוה *for Jehovah*, and the other lot לעזאזא *for Azazel*.' Now the obvious impression on reading this would be, that a personal antithesis was intended. Jehovah certainly, the first party, is a person; and as precisely the same formula of expression occurs in regard to the other, why should we not consider that also as a person? But according to the present rendering, the preposition ל *for*, in the two successive clauses, is made to bear two entirely different significations. In the former it denotes *to*, in the sense of *appropriation*—in the latter it denotes *for*, in the sense of *designation to a particular purpose*. Is this probable? Indeed, we see not why, if 'Azazel' is to be understood as the name of one goat, 'Jehovah' is not as properly to be understood as the name of the other. But from this alternative the mind instinctively shrinks back.

As then the objection to this theory of the derivation and meaning of the word appears to be sufficiently valid to warrant its rejection; and as we seem forced, at the same time, to adopt only such an exposition as shall assume the *personality* of the 'Azazel' of the text, the question at once arises, what *person* can we suppose to be intended by the appellation? This is indeed a question of very grave import, and we feel a strong necessity laid upon us of making peace with the pre-possessions of our readers, when we announce our firm conviction, that not only a *personal being*, but an *evil demon*, real or imaginary, is signified by this unique and anomalous term.

In presenting our purposed array of authorities in support of this opinion, we begin with the translation of the Seventy. The words of our English version, 'One lot for the Lord and the other lot for the scape-goat,' they have thus rendered:—κλῆρον ἕνα τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ κλῆρον ἕνα τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ, *one lot to the Lord, and one lot to the Apopompeus*, or *sender-away*. The Greek word ἀποπομπαῖος, though rendered *passively* in our translation, and so understood and interpreted by several of the early fathers, yet according to the analogy of the language, and doubtless according to the intention of the versionists, is properly a term of *active* signification. The reader has only to turn to the learned pages of Bochart to see this point established beyond a doubt. (Hieroz, P. I. L. II. c. 54. T. I. p. 745–7.) In this sense it is held by many critics of distinguished name to import one of that class of demons or deities who were called by the Latins *Dii Averrunci*, or *the deities who send away or avert evils from their votaries*, which was done through the propitiating agency of prayers, sacrifices, and other offerings. This is confirmed by Gesenius, from whose Hebrew Lexicon we extract, in this connexion, what he says on the word עזאזל *Azazel*: 'I render it without hesitation *the averter, expiator, averruncus*, ἀλεξίκακος, i. e. for עזלזל *Azalzel*, from the root עזל *azal*, *to remove, to separate*. By this name I suppose is to be understood originally some idol that was appeased with sacrifices, as Saturn and Mars; but afterwards, as the names of idols were often transferred to demons, it seems to denote an evil demon dwelling in the desert, and to be placated with victims, in accordance with this very ancient and also Gentile rite. The name Azazel is also used by the Arabs for an evil demon. (See Reland de Relig. Moham.

p. 189. Meninski, h. v.) The etymology which we have above proposed, was expressed of old by the Sept. translator, although neglected or misunderstood by most interpreters. Thus he renders it v. 8, τῷ Ἀποπομπαίῳ, i. e. Ἀποτροπαίῳ, Ἀλεξίκακῳ, *averrunco*; v. 10, εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπήν *ad averruncundum*; v. 16, εἰς ἄφεσιν. The ecclesiastical fathers have referred this Ἀποπομπαῖος to the *goat* itself, q. d. *scape-goat*, although obviously in v. 8 the antithesis lies between לעזאזל and ליהוה.' That ἀποπομπαιος is indeed of the active instead of passive signification, not only has Bochart clearly proved by a long list of classic citations, but the words of Josephus in reference to this rite throw a strong light on this sense of the Sept. rendering: 'The goat is sent away into a remote desert *as an averter of ills* (ἀποτροπιασμος), and a satisfaction for the sins of the people.' (Antiq. Jud. L. III. c. 10.)

It is clear then, we think, both that the LXX esteemed the 'Azazel' a person, and that they supposed that person to be a demon, or deity of the order of 'Averrunci,' or *averters*. That the same opinion was held by the early Christians, we seem to have clear proof from the words of Origen, who, in attempting to show that the devil was known in the times of Moses, says among other things, 'He who is called in Leviticus ἀποπομπαῖος, and whom the Hebrew Scriptures call Azazel, *was no other than the devil*.' The same conclusion was drawn from this language by the apostate emperor Julian, who maintained that since Moses speaks of the devotement of a goat to a deity called ἀποπομπαῖος in contradistinction from Jehovah, he in effect taught the very same doctrine as that inculcated by the heathen theologists respecting the *Dii Averrunci*. He was answered at length by Cyril of Alexandria, but we are not concerned with the arguments of either, any farther than as they serve as testimonies to the fact of an early belief in the Christian church that 'Azazel' in the Pentateuch was the name of an evil demon. That this belief is to be traced to the demonology of the Jews, we think there can be no doubt. Rabbi Menahem in his commentary on Leviticus, says that Azazel was one of the four principal demons whose names he writes together as follows: Sammael, Azazel, Azael, and Mahazael. In like manner the apocryphal book of Enoch makes mention of Azalel, or as it was afterwards written, Azael, among the fallen angels. The same is affirmed in the Rabbinical work entitled *Zohar*. Mercer in his commentary on Genesis relates as a traditional dogma of the Cabalists, that demons and all kinds of malignant spirits were prone to dwell in burial places and solitudes, and that Azazel was the name of one of this class of beings. Nor are we to forget that the New Testament allusions make it evident, that in the popular belief of the Jews the deserts and desolate places were the chosen haunts of these foul fiends. Our Lord underwent his temptation from the devil in the wilderness, and it was hither that the legion of evil demons is said to have driven the possessed man ere they were ejected from him by the word of Christ. It is, moreover, through dry and desert places that the unclean spirit is represented by the Savior as walking after he had quitted the body of the demoniac. It goes also strikingly to confirm this view of the subject, that those desert-deities were generally conceived of as having the semblance of *goats*, or rough, hairy, shaggy creatures, corresponding with the Satyrs of the Greek and Roman mythology, which were sylvan deities or demigods, represented as monsters half man and half goat, having horns on their heads, hairy bodies, with the feet and tail of the goat. Thus the prophet Isaiah in predicting the ruin of Babylon, says, ch. 13. 21, 'Wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures, and

owls shall dwell there, and *satyrs* (שעירם *Seïrim, goats*) shall dance there;' where the Gr. has *δαιμόνια, demons;* the Vulg. 'Pilosi,' *shaggy* or *hairy animals;* and the Chal. 'Demons.' The popular ideas of the external form and appearance of the devil among the rude and ignorant of nearly all nations, both ancient and modern, easily connect themselves with these early traditions, and the language of holy writ in the following passage goes clearly to evince the origin of the vulgar associations. Lev. 17. 7, 'And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto *devils* (שעירם lit. *goats*) after whom,' &c. 2 Chron. 11. 15, 'And he ordained him priests for the high places, and for the *devils* (שעירם *goats*) and for the calves which he had made.' On the peculiar usage of the original term, Kimchi in his Lexicon (voc. שעיר *Saïr*) remarks, 'They (demons) are called goats, because they appear in the shape of goats to their votaries.' It would seem then that there are good grounds for recognizing in this term a designed allusion to some kind of desert-demon to whom the second goat was in a manner dedicated, devoted, or consigned, but not sacrificed, as this would be a direct contravention of the precept just quoted from Lev. 17. 7, 'They shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils.'

Still the grand question remains to be solved, why the goat was consigned or devoted *at all* to Azazel? The Rabbins, who for the most part understand Azazel to mean the evil spirit, have advanced some singular notions on this subject. Substituting the name Sammael for Azazel, R. Eliezer scruples not to say, that they offer a gift to Sammael, or Satan, on the day of atonement, lest he should make their oblations fruitless. Indeed, we are told that it became a current proverb among the Hebrews, 'A gift to Sammael on the day of atonement.' The idolatrous character of this offering, Moses Gerundinensis endeavors, indeed, to explain away, but still in such terms as assure us of the fact:—'Our intention when we let loose the goat, is not to present him as an oblation to Sammael. God forbid!—but our desire is to do the will of our Creator, who has delivered to us such a commandment.' What is yet stranger, some of the more ancient Christians, who used the Greek translation of the Seventy, were thence led to imagine that 'of the two goats, one was sacrificed to God, and the other was sent into the desert to propitiate an evil and impure demon, thus venerated as an *apopompean* spirit.' For this impiety they are deservedly censured by Cyril and Procopius; and it is well remarked by Moulensis, that 'the goat was not sacrificed to the demon Azazel, for it is only said that it was *conveyed into the desert;* for it were a great disgrace to the God of the Hebrews, if he could not deliver his worshippers from demons, and if they were compelled to propitiate the devil lest he should hurt them.' And in this connexion we may advert to the opinion of Spencer, (De Legib. Heb. L. iii. Dissert. viii. p. 1040), who takes the name 'Azazel,' as compounded of עז *az, strong,* and אזל *azal, to depart;* implying the *strong receder,* or *powerful apostate,* an appropriate denomination, he supposes, of the devil as the *arch rebel and revolter;* to which may be added, that he and other beings of his class were prone, according to popular estimation, to *withdraw* themselves from all frequented places, and hover about dreary solitudes, tombs, ruins, and deserts. The reasons which he assigns for the extraordinary rite of the consignment of the goat to Azazel, are the three following: (1.) That the animal thus laden with the sins of the people and delivered up to the demon, might denote the wretched lot of all sinners. (2.) That the dedication of this goat thus circumstanced to an evil demon might serve to show the Israelites the impurity of apostate spirits, and so divert and take them off, and others

also, from all proneness to hold intercourse with such beings. (3.) That since their sins were sufficiently expiated by the piacular goat sent out to Azazel, they might more willingly abstain from all application to the *apopompean* gods of the Gentiles.

These reasons, though free from the absurd impiety of the Rabbinical superstition, strike the sober mind as at once far-fetched and fanciful, and we are shut up to the necessity of seeking for a more satisfactory solution of the problem. In attempting this, let us recur again to the incidents mentioned in the text as connected with this singular transaction. V. 9, 10: 'And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, and offer him for a sin-offering. But the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him (לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו *lekappĕr alauv*, *to expiate or atone over or upon him*,) to let him go for Azazel into the wilderness.' And then again, after describing the ceremonies of the slain-goat, he adds, v. 21, 22, 'He shall bring the live goat, and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat into the wilderness.'

Typical Import of the Scape-Goat.

The common interpretation given by divines of this typical rite—an interpretation built for the most part on the presumption that 'Azazel' was the name of the scape-goat, is substantially this:—The two goats constituted in fact but one offering, having a direct typical reference to Christ, who laid down his life for us in the character of a sacrificial victim, and to whom the load of our iniquities was transferred by imputation. But Christ is contemplated in this type in a two-fold aspect, one as *dying* for our sins, the other as *rising again* for our justification. But to this two-fold phasis of the mediatorial work of Christ, no *single* offering could suitably correspond. A *double* oblation, it is supposed, was made necessary by the very nature of the case. One goat slain could only show us a sacrificed Savior; it could not show us a living Savior. One could not exhibit him 'who liveth and was dead, and is alive forevermore.' There must be two to convey the great truth, that Christ was 'put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit;' that 'he was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification;' that 'he was crucified through weakness, and yet liveth by the power of God.' All this, it is held, is significantly taught by the two-fold symbol of the slain and the emissary goat, the one designed as a *vicarious sacrifice for sin*, the other as *a living memorial of its benign effects*. In the latter we see the sins of believers *carried away*, and *removed* from them as far as the east is from the west; in a word, as lost, blotted out, extinguished forever from the divine remembrance.

This view of the typical purport of the rite before us is very ancient, having been held by Theodoret, Cyril, Augustin, and Procopius, and while ingenious and plausible in itself, it does not, that we are aware, go counter to the general genius of the Mosaic economy, distinguished, as it was, by a vast and unspeakable richness of symbolical imagery. At the same time, we cannot but suggest, that this explanation labors under a liability to two objections of considerable weight. (1.) The sins of Israel, in the typical ceremony, were laid upon the head of the live goat, which was then, as a figure of the risen, justified, and justifying Savior, to be sent away into the wilderness. But

how does this correspond with the facts in regard to the Antitype. Christ bore the sins of men, not as *rising*, but as *dying*. He rose from the dead, and entered into glory 'without sin;' nor do we any where learn that he continues *after* his death to sustain the same *expiatory* office that he did *at* his death. On the contrary, we are assured that he was '*once* offered to bear the sins of many;' and that 'by this *one* offering he hath forever perfected them that believe.' (2.) We learn from v. 26, that 'he that let go the goat for Azazel was to wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water, and afterwards come into the camp.' From this it appears, that contact with the goat made the person who handled him, even for the purpose of sending him away, unclean. This was in consequence of the sins with which the scape-goat was putatively charged and loaded previous to his dismission. But as no uncleanness can be supposed to attach to Christ *subsequent to his resurrection*, it is difficult to conceive how any ceremonial taint should cleave to his representing symbol.

Influenced by these and other considerations, and dissenting moreover, from the opinion that 'Azazel' was the name of the goat, Faber, following the footsteps of Witsius, has propounded the following solution of the spiritual purport of the rite. (Hor. Mos. vol. ii. p. 259, Comp. Witsius on the Covenants, vol. ii. p. 230.) 'Christ,' he remarks, 'laid down his life for us that we might go free; and this sacrifice of himself upon the cross, was typified by every bloody sacrifice under the Law, and therefore, among others, by the piacular devotement of that goat, which fell by lot to Jehovah. Here we have the great mystery of the gospel, so well described by the apostle, as that which could alone exhibit God both just and yet the justifier of them that believe in Christ Jesus. But this is not the whole of our Lord's character. At the very commencement of the Bible, it was foretold that, although the promised seed of the woman shall finally bruise the head of the serpent, yet the serpent should first bruise his heel or mortal part. If then the serpent was to bruise his mortal part, that mortal part must needs be delivered over to the power of the serpent; for of himself, he could possess no such superiority, even during a single moment. Hence it will follow, that Satan, bent only on satiating his own malice, and unconscious that he was actually subserving the divine purposes of mercy, was the agent who, through his earthly tools effected the death of the Messiah. . . . . Such being the Scriptural character of our Lord, it is evident that no *single* type can perfectly exhibit it in both its parts. The various bloody sacrifices of the Law prefigured it in *one* part, viz., *that which respected the atonement made with God for the sins of man;* but they spoke nothing concerning its *other* part, viz., *that which respected the delivering up of the Messiah to the infernal serpent, with the permissive power of bruising his mortal frame.* On this second part they were silent; and if it were at all to be shadowed out under the ceremonial law, such a purpose could only be effected by the introduction of a new type, connected indeed with the usual sacrificial type, but kept nevertheless studiously distinct from it. A *double* type, in short, must be employed, if the character of Christ under its *two-fold* aspect was to be completely prefigured.

Now the two goats, which are jointly denominated a *sin-offering*, (Lev. 16. 5,) constitute a type of this identical description. The two together present us with a perfect symbolical delineation of our Lord's official character, while he was accomplishing the great work of our redemption. The goat which fell to the lot of Jehovah was devoted as a sin-offering, after the manner of any other sin-offering, by its being piacularly slain. This type represented the Messiah in the act of

satisfying the strict justice of God, by consenting to lay down his life sacrificially in our stead, and on our behalf. But the goat which fell to the lot of Azazel was first imputatively loaded with the sins of the whole people, and was then symbolically given up to the rage of the evil spirit, by being turned loose into the wilderness, which was deemed his favorite terrestrial haunt. This second type represented the Messiah burdened with the transgressions of all mankind, deserted for a season by his heavenly Father, and delivered into the hand of the prince of darkness, with a full permission granted to the apostate angel, of mortally bruising his heel or human nature. Such I conceive to be the plain and obvious interpretation of the ceremonial which was observed in the great day of atonement. Yet from a part of the ordinance respecting the live goat, I think it not improbable that a special previsionary regard may have been mysteriously had to a very remarkable part of our Savior's history. When the goat was delivered up to the malice of Satan, it was turned loose *into the wilderness*. In a similar manner, 'Jesus was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil' (Matt. 4. 1); and here, when he had fasted forty days, and was afterwards an hungered, the fiend commenced upon him that series of attacks which terminated only with his death upon the cross. Thus perfect throughout is the similitude between the type and the antitype.'

This view we submit to the reader for what he may deem it worth. If we had not what we esteem a still better solution to propose, we should be inclined to adopt it, at least in preference to the common and accredited mode of explication. But we think we can point out 'a more excellent way' of solving the mystery of the scape-goat, and to this we now invite attention, simply premising that a hint contained in a quotation from the old commentator, Conrad Pellican, whose own work we have never seen, contains the germ of the exposition, which we have expanded to much fuller dimensions, and sustained by a new array of evidence, in the remarks that follow.

It is evident, that in making out the proof that 'Azazel' signifies something else than the scape-goat itself, a new complexion is given at once to the whole passage. If the falling of the lot to Azazel indicated the consignment of the emissary goat to some real or imaginary spirit of evil, then it is palpable that a typical or symbolical scope entirely different from the common one must be recognized in the ceremony. We do not perceive in what sense, or with what propriety, an animal could be dedicated to Satan, and still be considered as a type of Christ. 'Satan cometh, and hath nothing in me,' said the Savior himself when on earth, and we cannot but ask, on what ground a typical rite is to be referred to Him, the direct and prominent import of which expressed a *peculiar appropriation* to Satan, as of something to which he had an acknowledged and paramount right. Surely no one can be insensible to the incongruity which reigns throughout the whole transaction, viewed in this light. However plausible the arguments in favor of such an interpretation, we shrink instinctively from it as derogatory to the pure and sinless nature, and the holy designation of Jesus. Whatever else might have been shadowed forth by this institute of the Jewish law, we are sure that we are not to look for a prefiguration of Him who was dedicated as a divine *Deodand* to God, in a goat set apart by mystic ceremonies to the devil.

What, then, are we to understand by this significant item in the ordinances of the great day of atonement? Something of a symbolical character all will admit in the dismission of the goat, loaded with sin, into the wilderness. Whatever the implication may be, the

ceremony itself cannot, we think, imply that the animal, considered in its emblematic character, was regarded by God as *acceptable*, or looked upon with a complacent eye, but rather the reverse. It was something which was *put away* as from a feeling of aversion, while on the contrary, the other goat was retained, and, when turned into a sacrificial offering, came up before the Lord as a sweet-scented savor. This utterly diverse treatment and disposal of the two animals, compels us to recognize in each an antitypical substance, which was to meet with corresponding entertainment at the hands of Jehovah. The one victim pointed to a substance which was to be pre-eminently well pleasing to him; the other, one from which he would turn away with displacency and loathing. The former plainly received its realization in Christ, the beloved Son, in whom his soul delighted; the latter must be accomplished in something which, in comparison, he abhors. In looking around for an object which shall answer these conditions, we know of none that so fully and so fairly meets the demand as *the Jewish people themselves*. It is here, if we mistake not, in the apostate, derelict, and reprobate race of Israel, rejected (not irrevocably) for their rejection of the Messiah, that we behold the substantiated truth of the shadow before us.

Certain it is that this signal event of the judicial rejection of the covenant people, was in the prescience of Jehovah ages before it occurred, and we see nothing incongruous in the idea, that it might have been mystically fore-shown by some appropriate rite in the ancient economy. And if this be granted, what *occasion* more suitable for the exhibition of this rite, than that of the great national festival of expiation, in which the atoning death of the divine substitute for sinners was most significantly set forth? This day was replete with solemn prognostics of that still more momentous day when Christ, the true victim, should make his soul an offering for sin; and we well know that it was in putting the Messiah to death on that occasion, that that wicked nation were so to concentrate and consummate their guilt as to necessitate, to the divine counsels, their exclusion from the pale of the covenant, at least for a long lapse of centuries. We may indeed admit that such a typical intimation would be very apt to be in its own nature obscure. It would be one of peculiarly latent meaning for the time then being, for the people would be slow to read the sentence of their own rejection in any of the national rites, and in order that it might not be read, it was doubtless designedly shrouded in a veil not easily penetrated, and couched in an action so closely connected with another of different import, that it was in itself easily susceptible of a construction apparently sound, yet really fallacious and false.

We are well aware that it may be objected to this mode of viewing the transaction, that the sins of the congregation were, by putative transfer, laid upon the head of the emissary goat, as their appointed substitute, in whose *dis*mission they were to find *re*mission. The language, moreover, would seem to be peculiarly express to this effect, when it is said that the scape-goat should be 'presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, to let him go for Azazel into the wilderness.' How then does this comport with the idea of the Jewish people being the substance of the type in question? Does it not follow that they were themselves the victim of expiation for their own sins, instead of their sins being laid upon Christ, the grand propitiation for the sins of the world? We answer, undoubtedly it does. This, in fact, we conceive to be the very aim and drift of the ceremony before us, viz., to intimate that the guilty race were to 'bear their iniquity,' that they were, upon their rejection of the Messiah, to be sent forth into the wilderness of the world,

scattered over the broad surface of the earth, and after being loaded with the guilt of that blood which they imprecated upon their own and the heads of their children, to be delivered over to the dominion of darkness, of which Satan, under the mystic denomination of Azazel, was the reputed prince and potentate. This we are certain was the *fact* in regard to the great body of the outcast nation of Israel according to the flesh, and as before remarked, we see no grounds to question that an event of so much moment should have been darkly, yet significantly, shadowed forth in the typical ordinances of that solemn day which celebrated prospectively the events of the atonement. Nor do we read any insuperable objection to this in the language of the institute itself; 'to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scape-goat (to or for Azazel) into the wilderness.' We have already intimated that the original לכפר עליו *lekappër âlauv*, properly imports, *to make an atonement over, upon, or for him*, instead of *with* or *by him*, instrumentally, as rendered in our translation. The goat in this act was plainly considered as the *subject*, and not the *medium*, of atonement or reconciliation. The interposition of the particle על is extremely common after the verb כפר *kaphar*, to denote the *object* of expiation or pacification, expressed by that Hebrew term. Thus, Lev. 4. 20, 'And the priest shall *make an atonement for them* (כפר עלהם *kipper alëhem*), and it shall be forgiven them,' i. e. the congregation. So also in v. 18 of this chapter:—'And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and *make an atonement for it*, (כפר עליו *kipper âlauv*).' So again, v. 30—'For on that day shall the priest *make an atonement for you* (יכפר עליכם *yekapper alëkem*).' In v. 33, the same usage repeatedly occurs:—'And he shall make an atonement *for* (על) the priests, and *for* (על) all the people of the congregation.' From these instances of the usus loquendi, which might be indefinitely multiplied, it would seem to be indisputable that the goat was not viewed in this connexion as the *instrument*, but as the *object* of the expiation, and a reference to the Concordance we believe will show that the preposition על *al* is never used in a similar connexion with כפר *kaphar*, but as denoting the *person* or *thing* which is the *object* of the atonement. Our English translation therefore is unquestionably wrong in rendering it in this place 'with him,' instead of 'over, upon, or for him.'

But still it may be asked *how* an atonement or reconciliation was made *for, over*, or *on account of*, the scape-goat, seeing that all the action mentioned was confined to the animal itself? We refer for answer to the passage under consideration, and beg that its phraseology may be carefully scanned; 'to make an atonement for him, to let him go to Azazel into the wilderness.' Our translators have here gratuitously inserted the word 'and' before 'to let him go,' which is wanting in the original, and the absence of which affords, we believe, the true clue to the interpretation. The latter clause is exegetical of the former. *The atonement was made by the letting go of the goat to Azazel.* He was consigned over, by way of judgment and punishment, to the jurisdiction of Satan, as the type of a similar allotment towards the recreant and rejected Jews. It was thus, and thus only, that the Most High was to be *propitiated* for their offences, and we have only to appeal to the truth of history to learn how accurately the fact has corresponded with the typical prediction.

But this is to be shown more fully by reference to the evangelical narrative, where, in the details of the crucifixion-scene, we may expect to recognize the fulfilment of the Old Testament earnests. There we behold the elect and accepted victim meekly submitting to the fearful

death which the body of the nation clamorously demanded, and by demanding which they sealed their own doom of dereliction. And as if on purpose to make the coincidences more remarkable, the controlling providence of God so orders it that almost by the decision of a lot Barabbas is released and Jesus retained for execution. In this incident we are furnished with a striking counterpart to the ceremonies of the expiation-day. In the release of the robber Barabbas we see the lot coming up with the inscription, 'for Azazel,' while in the condemnation of Christ, we read the opposite allotment, 'for Jehovah.' We cannot refrain from regarding Barabbas in this transaction as an impersonation, a representative type, of the whole people to whom he belonged, and in the words of Peter on the day of Pentecost, we more than imagine that we see described the very process of *selection* and *rejection* which stands forth before us in the prescribed ceremonies of the Jewish Law; Acts 3. 13–15: 'The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our father has glorified his Son Jesus, whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead.' Here we have the typical scene of the wilderness vividly enacted before us in its substantiated realities of a far different place and a far distant age. In Barabbas released, with all his crimes upon his head, in accordance with the emission of the goat loaded with the sins of the congregation, we see a lively, and we doubt not, a designed, emblematic presentation of the fact of the judicial thrusting forth of that covenant race, with the weight of the imprecated curse of God abiding upon them from one generation to another. Nay, so precise is the accordance between the items of the adumbration and of the accomplishment, that we behold in Pilate the fore-shadowed 'fit man' by whom the discharged goat was led forth into the wilderness. 'He shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness.' The original is peculiar: בְּיַד אִישׁ עִתִּי *beyad ish itti, by the hand of a man timely, opportune, seasonable.* The proper Greek rendering, as Bochart remarks, is *καιρίῳ*, or *εὐκαίρῳ*, *well-timed;* and the evangelist, in his account of Pilate's *time-serving* agency in the events of the crucifixion, presents us with the very *man for the nonce*, who is so significantly designated by the epithet before us. Matt. 27. 20–26: 'But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas and destroy Jesus. The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus, which is called Christ? They all say unto him, Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why? what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and our children. Then released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified.'

We here leave the subject, commended to the calm consideration of our readers, to whom we say, in the language of Spencer, proposing his views of the same subject,—'Si quis lumine perspicaciore donatus, hujus instituti rationes solidiores assignaverit, me minime pertinacem experietur;' *If any one possessed of clearer discernment*

9 And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the LORD's lot fell, and offer him *for* a sin-offering.

10 But the goat on which the lot fell to be the scape-goat, shall be presented alive before the LORD, to make [k] an atonement with him, *and* to let him go for a scape-goat into the wilderness.

11 And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin-offering, which *is* for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself, and for his house, and shall kill the bullock of the sin-offering which *is* for himself:

12 And he shall take [l] a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the LORD, and his hands full of [m] sweet incense beaten small, and bring *it* within the vail:

13 [n] And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the LORD, that the cloud of the incense may cover the [o] mercy-seat that *is* upon the testimony, that he die not.

[k] 1 John 2. 2.

[l] ch. 10. 1. Numb. 16. 18, 46. Rev. 8. 5. [m] Exod. 30. 34 [n] Exod. 30. 1, 7, 8. Numb. 16. 7, 18, 46. Rev. 8, 3, 4. [o] Exod. 25. 21.

---

shall assign better reasons for this ordinance, he will find me far from being obstinate in adhering to my own solution.

The Sin-offering for Aaron himself.

11. *And Aaron shall bring the bullock*, &c. Upon comparing this verse with v. 6 above, it is quite evident that the term 'offer' there implies no more than *bringing the bullock to be offered*, and not the actual oblation, which did not take place till after the lots were cast upon the goats.——¶ *For his house.* That is, says Sol. Jarchi, 'for his brethren the priests; for they all are called his house, as it is written, Ps. 135. 19, 'O house of Aaron, bless ye the Lord.' And all their atonement was not, save for the uncleanness of the sanctuary, and the holy things thereof.'

12. *And he shall take a censer full of burning coals from off the altar*, &c. This censer or fire-pan is called in the Gr. of the LXX. πυρειον, *fire-vessel*, but in the New Testament this term never occurs; instead of it we have λιβανωτος, *incense-vessel* or *censer*, as Rev. 8. 3, 5, where mention is made of a 'golden censer.' And it is worthy of remark that the Hebrew writers say, 'Every (other) day, he whose duty it is to use the censer, putteth coals on a censer of silver, &c, but on this day the high priest putteth coals on a censer of gold.' This service of burning incense, it will be noticed, comes in *between* the slaying of the bullock and the sprinkling of the blood in the holy of holies. The way into the inner sanctuary was to be prepared as it were, and the Most High made still more placable, by this preliminary act of raising a cloud of incense about the mercy-seat. That it had a typical purport there can be little doubt. Christ, before he entered with his own blood into heaven, the true holy of holies, prepared and sanctified himself and his entrance thither by his earnest prayer as recorded John 17, the whole of which chapter viewed in this connexion seems to resolve itself into a fragrant cloud of incense coming up before the Father's throne prior to the effusion of his blood in its atoning efficacy. That this incense-offering was symbolical of prayer will be obvious upon reference to Rev. 8. 3, 4, 'And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God, out of the angel's hand.' See Note on Ex. 30. 3.

13. *The mercy-seat that is upon the*

14 And [p] he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and [q] sprinkle *it* with his finger upon the mercy-seat eastward: and before the mercy-seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times.

15 ¶ [r] Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering that *is* for the people, and bring his blood [s] within the vail, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat:

16 And he shall [t] make an atonement for the holy *place*, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth

[p] ch. 4. 5. Heb. 9. 13, 25, and 10. 4. [q] ch. 4. 6. [r] Heb. 2. 17, and 5. 2, and 9. 7, 28. [s] ver. 2. Heb. 6. 19, and 9. 3, 7, 12.

[t] See Exod. 29. 36. Ezek. 45. 18. Heb. 9. 22, 23.

---

testimony. That is, upon or over the tables of the law which were in the ark, often called the testimony.

14. *And he shall take of the blood*, &c. It is to be understood that he had in the mean time come out of the most holy place, and now taking the blood, he returned thither, and sprinkled it, as the Jews maintain, not so properly *upon* as *towards* the ark; for it is thus that they understand the original על פני *al penë*, *over against or towards*. The Gr. however has επι το ιλαστηριον, *upon the mercy-seat*; and in v. 15 it is clear that this must be the sense.

The Sin-offering commanded for the People.

15. *Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering*, &c. After he had sprinkled the bullock's blood for himself, he left it, says Maimonides, in the temple, upon a vase of gold that was there, and afterwards went out of the temple and killed the goat for the people. The blood of this victim he dealt with as with that of the bullock, as described in the preceding verse.

16. *And he shall make an atonement for the holy place*, &c. That is, by the ceremonies foregoing, which he has just described. It was not a separate proceeding by which this expiation was made. But the ordinance itself is a most striking commentary upon the innate and actual depravity of fallen man. Though the high priest alone entered into the holy of holies, yet it thereby became defiled, and must be purified from the uncleanness contracted by its contact with his person, even while engaged in the most sacred duties. So also with the tabernacle and the altar. The defiling power of the collective iniquities of the people subjected those structures also to the necessity of a similar purgation.—¶ *The tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness*. Heb. השכן *hash-shokën*, *that abideth*. The root of the original word is שכן *shâkan*, from which comes *shekinah*, and it would scarcely be out of the way to render it here,—'that *shekinizeth* among them.' The Gr. however has εκτισμενη, *builded, constructed, formed*; and to this word the apostle doubtless had reference in Heb. 9. 11, 'through a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, *not of this building* (ου ταυτης της κτισεως).' 'The temple of his body and the veil of his flesh, John 2. 21, Heb. 10. 20, were by imputation of our sins made as unclean, and sprinkled with his own precious blood, that he might reconcile us to God. Heb. 23. It was necessary that (Moses' tabernacle and Solomon's temple) the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (the sacrifices before mentioned), but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.'—*Ainsworth.*

among them in the midst of their uncleanness.

17 [u] And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy *place*, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel.

18 And he shall go out unto the altar that *is* before the LORD, and [x] make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar round about.

[u] See Exod. 34. 3. Luke 1. 10. [x] Exod. 30. 10. ch. 4. 7, 18. Heb. 9. 22, 23.

19 And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and [y] hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.

20 ¶ And when he hath made an end of [z] reconciling the holy *place*, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat:

21 And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, [a] putting them upon the

[y] Ezek. 43. 20. [z] ver. 16. Ezek. 45. 20. [a] Isai. 53. 6.

17. *And there shall be no man in the tabernacle*, &c. None either of the people, or the priests who might ordinarily be in attendance upon the services of the tabernacle. Throughout this most important part of the ceremony the high priest officiated alone. In this fact the typical character of his sacred functions appears very conspicuous. The whole work of atonement for our sins was performed by Christ *alone*. No one aided him; no one participated with him; he bore all our sufferings; to him all the glory is due. He trod the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with him. His own arm brought salvation. '*By himself* he purged our sins.' '*His own self* bare our sins in his own body on the tree.'

18. *Shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord*. The words before the Lord' would seem to indicate that the golden altar of incense in the holy place is intended; and so it is generally understood by the Jewish and Christian commentators. In this case, the 'coming out' mentioned v. 17, must be referred to his coming out of the holy of holies into the outer room, where the altar of incense stood. Patrick, however, contends that the altar of sacrifice is meant which stood in the outer court, and that the high priest's 'coming out,' v. 17, and his 'going out,' v. 18, was his coming out from the tabernacle. There is some reason to think this the correct interpretation, as otherwise we have no account whatever of the outer altar's being cleansed. The inference, however, is still uncertain.——¶ *Shall take of the blood of the bullock and the goat*. The blood of each animal was to be put into a basin, and thoroughly mingled together in order to its being smeared and sprinkled upon the altar.

The Disposal of the Live or Scape-goat.

20. *And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place*. Heb. וכלה מכפר *vekillah mikkappër*, *and when he hath finished atoning*, or *making atonement for*. In like manner the original word for *atone* (at-one) is often rendered *to reconcile*; and on the other hand the Gr. καταλλαγη, *reconciliation*, is rendered Rom. 5. 11, by *atonement*. As we have gone so fully into the details of the ceremony of the dismission of the scape-goat in our introductory remarks, little need be said by way of comment on the remaining particulars.

head of the goat, and shall send *him* away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness:

22 And the goat shall [b] bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.

[b] Isai. 53. 11, 12. John 1. 29. Heb. 9. 28. 1 Pet. 2. 24.

22. *And the goat shall bear upon him all thine iniquities unto a land not inhabited.* Heb. אל ארץ גזרה *el eretz gezïrah, unto a land of separation.* As the Rabbinical traditions respecting this ordinance are well condensed by Mr. Kitto, we give his note from the Pictorial Bible. 'The Rabbins inform us, that after the lot had been taken, the high-priest fastened a long fillet, or narrow piece of scarlet to the head of the scape-goat; and that after he had confessed his own sins and those of the people over his head, or (for we are not quite certain about the point of time) when the goat was finally dismissed, this fillet changed color to white if the atonement was accepted by God, but else retained its natural color. It is to this that they understand Isaiah to allude when he says:—'Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.' (Isai. 1. 18.) After the confession had been made over the head of the scape-goat, it was committed to the charge of some person or persons, previously chosen for the purpose, and carried away into the wilderness; where, as we should understand, v. 22, it was set at liberty; but the Rabbins give a somewhat different account. They inform us, (speaking with a particular reference to Jerusalem and the Temple service), that the goat was taken to a place about twelve miles from Jerusalem where there was a formidable rocky precipice; and they add, that for this occasion a sort of causeway was made between Jerusalem and this place, and that ten tents with relays were stationed at equal distances between them. On arriving at the precipice the goat was thrown down from its summit, and by knocking against the projections, was generally dashed to pieces before it had half reached the bottom. It is added that the result of this execution was promptly communicated, by signals, raised at proper distances, to the people who were anxiously awaiting the event at the Temple. It is also said, that at the same time a scarlet ribbon, fastened at the entrance of the Temple, turned red at this instant of time, in token of the divine acceptance of the expiation; and that this miracle ceased forty years before the destruction of the second Temple. We do not very well understand whether this fillet is a variation of the account which places one on the head of the goat, or whether there were two fillets, one for the goat and the other for the Temple. If the latter, we may conclude that the change took place simultaneously in both. However understood, it is very remarkable that the Rabbins, who give this account of the fillets, assign the cessation of the miracle by which the divine acceptance of this expiation was notified, to a period precisely corresponding with the death of Christ—an event which most Christians understand to have been prefigured by atoning sacrifices, which they believe to have been done away by that final consummation of all sacrificial institutions. The assertion of the Apostle, that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin (Heb. 9. 22), renders the account of the Rabbins that the goat was finally immolated, rather than left free in the wilderness, far from improbable, were it not discountenanced by verse 22. It is however possible that the Jews may have adopted the usage described when they settled in Canaan, and could not so conveniently as in the wilderness carry the goat to

23 And Aaron shall come into the tabernacle of the congregation, [c] and shall put off the linen garments which he put on when he went into the holy *place*, and shall leave them there:

[c] Ezek. 42. 14, and 44. 19.

24 And he shall wash his flesh with water in the holy place, and put on his garments, and come forth, [d] and offer his burnt-offering, and the burnt-offering of the people, and make an atonement for himself, and for the people.

[d] ver. 3. 5.

'a land not inhabited.' But they allow that it sometimes escaped alive into the desert, and was usually taken and eaten by the Arabs, who, of course, were little aware of what they did. See Calmet, *Arts.* 'Azazel,' and 'Expiation;' 'Jennings' 'Jewish Antiquities,' &c.'

The Change of Vestments and the Subsequent Offering.

23. *And Aaron shall come into the tabernacle of the congregation, and shall put off the linen garments*, &c. The ceremonies that followed the dismission of the goat into the wilderness, are thus detailed by Maimonides: 'After he has sent away the goat by the hand of him that led him, he returns to the bullock and goat whose blood he had sprinkled within the sanctuary, and opens them and takes out the fat, which he puts in a vessel, to burn them upon the altar. And he cuts the rest of their flesh into large pieces, but one cleaving to another and not parted asunder; and these he sends by the hands of others to be carried out to the place of burning (without the camp, Lev. 16. 27). When the goat is come into the wilderness, the high priest goes out into the women's court to read the law. While he is reading, they burn the bullock and the goat in the place of the ashes (without the city), therefore he that sees the priest when he reads, sees not the bullock and the goat burnt. When he reads, all the people stand before him; and the minister of the congregation takes up the book of the law, and gives it to the chief of the congregation, and he to the sagan (or second chief priest), and the sagan gives it to the high priest, who stands up when he receives it, and reads standing the 16th, and part of the 23d, chapters of Leviticus, reading and blessing God both before and after. After this, he puts off his white garments, and washes himself, and puts on his golden garments, and sanctifies his hands and his feet, and offers the goat which is for the general addition to this day's service (Num. 29. 11), and offers his own ram, and the people's ram, as it is said, Lev. 16. 24. He then burns (on the altar) the fat of the bullock and of the goat, that were burnt without the camp; and he offers the daily evening sacrifice (the lamb, Num. 28. 3), and trims the lamps as on other days. After this he sanctifies his hands and feet, and puts off the golden garments, and puts on his own common garments, and goes to his house, whither all the people accompany him; and he keeps a feast, for that he is come out of the sanctuary.'—*Ainsworth.*—¶ *And shall leave them there.* Never more to be worn again, either by him or any one else, as they were required to be renewed every year. This is the uniform tradition of the Jews.

24. *He shall wash his flesh with water* &c. Heb. רחץ *ra'hatz*, usually rendered *wash*, though sometimes *bathe*, as in vv. 26, 28. How much of an ablution is properly implied by the term, it is difficult to say. That it does not indicate a complete immersion of the body in water, would seem evident from the fact, that we read of no provision being made for such a rite, either in the holy place or in the court of the tabernacle. At the same time, we cannot well doubt that it signifies something more than the mere washing of the hands and feet. On the whole, the idea of a *copious*

25 And [e] the fat of the sin-offering shall he burn upon the altar.
26 And he that let go the goat for the scape-goat shall wash his clothes, [f] and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward come into the camp.
27 [g] And the bullock *for* the sin-offering, and the goat *for* the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy *place*, shall *one* carry forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung.
28 And he that burneth them shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp.
29 ¶ And *this* shall be a statute for ever unto you: *that* [h] in the seventh month, on the tenth *day* of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and do no work at all, *whe-*

[e] ch. 4. 10. [f] ch 15. 5. [g] ch. 4. 12, 21, and 6. 30. Heb. 13. 11.

[h] Exod. 30. 10. ch. 23. 27. Numb. 29. 7. Isai. 58. 3, 5. Dan. 10. 3, 12.

---

affusion seems to come nearest to the genuine import of the term.

25. *And the fat of the sin-offering shall he burn upon the altar.* Heb. יקטיר *yaktir, shall fume or burn as incense*, according to the explanation given in the Note on Lev. 1. 9, Ex. 29. 13. The burning of the fat upon the altar, and the burning of the body without the camp, is expressed by Moses by two different words. The altar upon which the fat was to be burnt, was of course the brazen altar in the court yard, for upon the golden altar nothing of the kind was permitted. Ex. 30. 9.

26. *And he that let go the goat for the scape-goat.* Heb. המשלח את השעיר לעזאזל *hammeshalliëah eth hassaïr laazazel, he that sent or led away the goat to Azazel.* The reading of the original decidedly confirms our previous view of the true purport of Azazel. It is wholly at variance with the genius of the Hebrew to express such an idea as 'a goat for a scape-goat,' by such a phraseology as we here find. The force of the preposition ל *to*, has another bearing altogether. *It denotes devotement to a particular purpose or object.* The 'fit man' who was the agent in this transaction, was considered as having contracted so much defilement by the office he performed, that he was not permitted to re-enter the camp without having undergone a previous lustration of his person.

27. *Shall one carry forth without the camp.* For the evangelical import of this part of the ceremony, as explained by the apostle, Heb. 13. 11, see Note on Lev. 6. 30.

Recapitulation.

29. *This shall be a statute for ever unto you.* Heb. לחקת עולם *lehukkath olâm, for a statute of eternity.* That is, through the whole period of that economy till Christ, the substance of the Levitical shadows, should come. See Note on Ex. 21. 6, where this phraseology is more fully illustrated.—— ¶ *Ye shall afflict your souls.* Heb. תענו את נפשתיכם *taanu eth naphshothiëkem.* Gr. ταπεινωσατε τας ψυχας ὑμων, *ye shall humble souls.* Our English sense of the word *soul* does not come up to the full import either of the Hebrew or Greek. As we have already shown in the Note on Gen. 12. 5, and elsewhere, the term נפש *nephesh* is used as equivalent to *person*, and therefore includes the *body* as well as the *soul*,—and as fasting was one of the duties of the day, it is evidently to be understood in that latitude here. Thus also Ps. 35. 13, 'I *humbled* (Heb. afflicted) *my soul* with fasting.' Is. 58. 5, 'Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man to *afflict his soul?*' In the Hebrew idiom an abstinence from all corporeal delights, and a voluntary subjecting ones' self to penances and

ther it be one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you:

30 For on that day shall *the priest* make an atonement for you, to [i] cleanse you, *that* ye may be clean from all your sins before the LORD.

31 [k] It *shall be* a sabbath of rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls by a statute for ever.

32 [l] And the priest whom he shall anoint, and whom he shall [m] consecrate to minister in the priest's office in his father's stead, shall make the atonement, and [n] shall put on the linen clothes, *even* the holy garments:

33 And [o] he shall make an atone-

[i] Ps. 51. 2. Jer. 33. 8. Eph. 5. 26. Heb. 9. 13, 14, and 10. 1, 2. 1 John 1. 7, 9. [k] ch. 23. 32. [l] ch. 4. 3, 5, 16. [m] Exod. 29. 29, 30. Numb. 20, 26, 28. [n] ver. 4. [o] ver. 6, 16, 18, 19, 24.

ment for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar: and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation.

34 [p] And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins [q] once a year. And he did as the LORD commanded Moses.

CHAPTER XVII.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them, This *is*

[p] ch. 23. 31. Numb. 29. 7. [q] Exod. 30. 10. Heb. 9. 7, 25.

mortifications, is termed 'afflicting the soul.'——¶ *Do no work at all.* It being in fact regarded as a solemn Sabbath, as we learn from v. 31. It was to be a day wholly devoted to religious services of the most severe and engrossing character.

30. *For on that day*, shall the priest *make an atonement for you.* The expression in the original is impersonal, and consequently equivalent to 'atonement shall be made for you.' The Gr. has correctly εξιλασεται περι ὑμων, *it shall be atoned for you.* So also in like manner in v. 31, 'the priest whom he shall anoint' is but another form of saying, 'the priest who shall be anointed,' as is clearly intimated by the Gr. rendering; 'whom they shall anoint.'

34. *For all their sins once a year.* Many expiatory ceremonies have already passed under our notice, as required in various circumstances; but *this* was the grand and general expiation in which atoning sacrifices were made for *all* the sin and all the defilement of the preceding year. Hence it was pre-eminently distinguished as *the* Day of Atonement. The idea of the institution seems to have been, that inasmuch as the incidental and occasional sin-offerings had, from their very nature, left much sin for which no expiation had been made, there should be a day in which all omissions of this sort should be supplied, by one general expiation, so that at the end of the year no sin or pollution might remain for which the blood of atonement had not been shed.

CHAPTER XVII.

The preceding ordinances relative to the ministration of the High Priest in the Holy of Holies, are here followed by others of a miscellaneous nature, having respect to the whole nation in the matter of sacrificial offering, and therefore addressed to them conjointly with Aaron and his sons.

Precept in regard to the killing of Cattle.

1, 2. *Speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons.* That is, unto the priests; who were called 'the sons of Aaron,' by a usage of perpetual occurrence. As they

the thing which the LORD hath commanded, saying,

3 What man soever *there be* of the house of Israel, [a] that killeth

[a] See Deut. 12. 5, 15, 21.

were the appointed sacrificers for the people, the precepts before us were to be first addressed to them, and then through them to the whole collective people.

3. *What man* soever there be *of the house of Israel.* Heb. אִישׁ אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל *ish ish mibbaith Yisrael, man, man, of the house of Israel*; to which the Gr. adds, or of the proselytes that are adjoined unto you; which is virtually warranted by the language of Moses in v. 8. ¶ *That killeth an ox.* Heb. יִשְׁחָט *yish'hat*, a word properly signifying *to slaughter* in general, and not peculiarly limited to the slaying of animals by way of *sacrifice*, although very frequently employed in that sense. At the same time, considerable doubt hangs over its genuine import in this connexion. Commentators are by no means agreed as to the true-meant design of the precept. Michaelis, Rosenmuller, and others contend that the point of the enactment is, that the Israelites should bring the animals they intended to kill *for food* to the tabernacle, to be dealt with as *peace-offerings*, the blood being applied and the fat consumed as in such sacrifices, the rest being eaten by the offerer, as in the regular sacrifices of this class. In proof of this, Michaelis insists on the import of the original word שָׁחַט *sha'hat, to kill* in general, and its distinction from זָבַח *zaba'h, to kill for sacrifice.* But the use of these terms by the sacred writers is too indiscriminate to allow of any definite conclusion being built upon it. Still it is possible that what Michaelis affirms may be the genuine import of the passage, and the additional reason that he suggests for it is not without considerable weight, viz. the prevention of secret sacrifices to

an ox, or lamb, or goat in the camp, or that killeth *it* out of the camp,

4 [b] And bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the con-

[b] Deut. 12. 5, 6, 13, 14.

idols. 'Considering the propensity to idolatry which the people brought with them from Egypt, it was necessary to take care lest, when any one killed such animals as were usual for sacrifices, he should be guilty of superstitiously offering them to an idol. This precaution was the more reasonable, because, in ancient times, it was so very common to make an offering of the flesh which a person intended to eat, and because the Israelites could but rarely enjoy that sort of food in the wilderness. And hence arose a suspicion not very unreasonable, that whoever killed animals usually devoted to the altar, offered them of course; and therefore Moses enjoined the Israelites not to kill such animals otherwise than in public, and to offer them all to the true God, that so it might be out of their power to make them offerings to idols, by slaughtering them privately, and under the pretence of using them for food.'

But to this view of the subject there are two objections, apparently formidable, which Michaelis feels himself called upon to answer. (1.) It is asked whether it be credible that God would have imposed such a hardship upon his people as not to concede to them the use of animal food, unless it were first presented before the tabernacle, and then virtually converted into a religious offering? (2.) How is the precept, when thus viewed, to be reconciled with Deut. 12. 13-15, where, after commanding that all the burnt-offerings should be offered in one place, it is added, 'Notwithstanding, thou mayest kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of the LORD thy God which he hath given thee: the unclean and the

gregation, to offer an offering unto the LORD before the tabernacle of the LORD: blood shall be [c] imputed unto that man, he hath shed blood; and that man [d] shall be cut off from among his people:

[c] Rom. 5. 13.

[d] Gen. 17. 14.

clean may eat thereof, as of the roebuck, and as of the hart.'

To the first of these objections our author replies, that the Israelites, like most of the modern Orientals, particularly the nomade tribes, were but little addicted to the use of flesh-meat; that they seldom killed beasts but for sacrifice; and that among them seasons of sacrifice were for the most part the only seasons of feasting, so that what was enjoined by this law, was what would ordinarily be done, whether the animals were formally offered or not. This then would have been no particular hardship. Nor must we forget that while the Israelites continued in the wilderness, and without any appropriated lands, they could but very seldom have indulged in a flesh diet, without being in danger of extirpating their herds. Indeed, properly speaking, only the two tribes of Reuben and Gad, with the half tribe of Manasseh, *had* herds (Num. 32); the other tribes being in general but poorly provided in this respect. In these circumstances, the Israelites could easily bear a law which contributed to the preservation and increase of their herds; especially when we consider that during their sojourn in the wilderness, their cattle could not be multiplied as when they had ceased to be a nomade people.

As to the second objection, founded upon the grant so expressly recorded Deut. 12. 13–15, his solution is equally plausible. He thinks the law contained in the chapter before us was only intended to operate temporarily during the wandering in the wilderness, and that the law in Deuteronomy, delivered just before the entrance of the Hebrews into Canaan, was intended expressly to repeal that now under consideration. Indeed the language of that second statute would seem decidedly to favor this construction, for the amount of it is (v. 8, 9), that they were not to do in Palestine every thing which they were then in the practice of doing in the desert, every one at his pleasure, not being yet come to their permanent inheritance. It is contended, accordingly, that the reasons for the repeal are nearly as obvious as those for the original law. A new and more instructed generation would have arisen than that which had been so deeply imbued with the idolatries of Egypt, and the occasion for the restriction would therefore not have been strong. And besides, the observance of the original law would have been scarcely practicable when the Hebrews became settled in Palestine. They would naturally then be disposed to consume more animal food, as settled people usually do even in the East, than when nomades; and yet this law would nearly have operated as an interdiction to a great part of the population, who, residing at a distance from the tabernacle or temple, would have been obliged to take a long journey with their oxen, sheep, or goats, to offer them at the altar before they could taste their meat.

On the whole, although Ainsworth, Patrick, and some others understand this law as having reference solely to animals *killed for sacrifice*, yet we are more inclined to adopt the view stated above, which is adopted also by Scott and other expositors of high repute in modern times. For farther remarks upon the scope of the law itself, and some apparent exceptions, see Note on Deut. 12. 13–15.

4. *Blood shall be imputed unto that man.* That is, that man shall be accounted a murderer. In shedding the blood of the animal he shall be deemed

5 To the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices [e] which they offer in the open field, even that they may bring them unto the LORD, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest, and offer them *for* peace-offerings unto the LORD.

6 And the priest [f] shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the LORD *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and [g] burn the fat for a sweet savour unto the LORD.

7 And they shall no more offer their sacrifices [h] unto devils, after

[e] Gen. 21. 33, and 22. 2, and 31. 54. Deut. 12. 2. 1 Kings 14. 23. 2 Kings 16. 4, and 17. 10. 2 Chron. 28. 4. Ezek. 20. 28, and 22. 9.

[f] ch. 3. 2. [g] Exod. 29. 18. ch. 3. 5, 11, 16, and 4. 31. Numb. 18. 17. [h] Deut. 32. 17. 2 Chron. 11. 15. Ps. 106. 37. 1 Cor. 10. 20. Rev. 9. 20.

---

to have shed the blood of a human being, and guilt shall rest upon him accordingly. So in a case where a similar profanation of a divine ordinance, by disregarding its spirit, is spoken of, it is said, Is. 66. 3, 'He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man.'——¶ *That man shall be cut off.* Heb. נכרת האיש ההוא *nikrath hâish hahu*, which the Gr. renders ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη, *that soul shall be destroyed*, where it will be observed that 'that soul' in the version answers to 'that man' in the original. On the import of this phrase, see Note on Gen. 17. 14. The intimation here undoubtedly is, either that the sentence of death should be passed upon the offender by the magistrate, or that God would directly interfere and cut him off from among the living, though not, we presume, in a miraculous manner, but by so ordering his providence, as to ensure that result. The latter sense will perhaps appear the most probable by comparing the present with v. 10, where he threatens to execute vengeance with his own hand against him who should be guilty of 'eating blood.' If the punishment should seem severe, we are to remember that the law was intended to be a preventative to idolatry, and the penalties enacted for this crime were necessarily very severe, for the reasons mentioned in the Introduction to the Notes on the second volume of Exodus, to which the reader is referred.

5. *To the end*, &c. Expressive of the general scope of the present statute, which is to call them off from all practices of an idolatrous tendency, by requiring them to bring the flesh of slain animals which they would otherwise be in danger of sacrificing to demons in the open fields, to the precincts of the tabernacle, and there converting them to 'peace-offerings to the Lord' before they were eaten. So if we would have our daily food most signally blessed to us, let us first consecrate it to the bounteous Giver, and vow to him all the strength and refreshment that we may derive from the use of it.——¶ *Which they offer in the open field.* Heb. אשר הם זבחים על פני השדה *asher hëm zobe'him al penë hassadeh, which they* (are) *sacrificing on the face of the field*, i. e. which they were heretofore in the habit of offering, or which they might now be inclined to offer, after a heathen fashion, in the open fields and high places. The Jewish writers say, 'Before the tabernacle was set up, the high places were lawful; and the service was by the first-born; after the tabernacle was erected, the high places were unlawful, and the service was performed by the priests.' This limitation as to the place of worship is graciously done away under the gospel, Mal. 1. 11, 'My name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering.'

7. *They shall offer no more their sacrifices unto devils.* Heb. לשעירם *lasseïrim, to goats*; Chal. שדים *shadim, wasting or destroying creatures*; Gr. τοῖς μάταιοις, *to vain things.* Vulg.

whom they [i] have gone a whoring: this shall be a statute for ever unto them throughout their generations.

8 ¶ And thou shalt say unto them, Whatsoever man *there be* of the house of Israel, or of the strangers which sojourn among you, [k] that offereth a burnt-offering or sacrifice,

9 And [l] bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer it unto the LORD;

[i] Exod. 34. 15. ch. 20. 5. Deut. 31. 16. Ezek. 23. 8. [k] ch. 1. 2, 3. [l] ver. 4.

even that man shall be cut off from among his people.

10 ¶ [m] And whatsoever man *there be* of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; [n] I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people.

[m] Gen. 9. 4. ch. 3. 17, and 7. 26, 27, and 19. 26. Deut. 12. 16, 23, and 15. 23. 1 Sam. 14. 33. Ezek. 44. 7. [n] ch. 20. 3, 5, 6, and 26. 17. Jer. 44. 11. Ezek. 14. 8, and 15. 7.

'Dæmonibus,' *to demons*. The original Hebrew term here rendered 'devils,' properly signifies *hairy ones*, or creatures *rough*, *rugged*, and *shaggy* in aspect; and hence is applied not only to *he-goats*, but to certain fabulous beings or sylvan gods, who were popularly supposed to appear in the form of goats. Herodotus says that all goats were worshipped in Egypt, particularly the *he-goat*, and from these sprung Pan, Silenus, and the innumerable herd of imaginary beings, *satyrs*, *dryads*, *fauns*, &c. all woodland gods, and held in veneration among the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans. From this source too it is not unlikely that the popular representations of the devil in Christian countries, in which he is represented as having a *goat-like* form, with a tail, horns, and cloven feet, are borrowed. Such representations certainly bear a strong resemblance to what was fancied of the appearance of the ancient heathen Pan, whose name, from his striking *terror* into the popular mind, has given rise to our English word *panic*. The language would seem evidently to imply that the Israelites had been formerly, or during their residence in Egypt, addicted to the worship of these fictitious deities.——¶ *After whom they have gone a whoring*. Chal. 'With whom they have erred or committed idolatry.' This term is often employed in the Scriptures to denote *idolatry*, because that was a violation of the covenant between God and his people, which is repeatedly denominated *a marriage covenant*. Comp. Ex. 34. 15, Deut. 31. 16, Judg. 8. 33.

8, 9. *And thou shalt say unto them*, &c. The law enacted in these two verses we conceive to differ from the foregoing, by having respect exclusively to beasts slain for *sacrifice*, and not for *food*. It is an emphatic declaration of the divine will as to the place where all sacrificial offerings should be made. As God designed there should be one altar, one high-priest, one sanctuary, and one commonwealth of Israel, this unity of the nation and the religion would be destroyed if various altars and priests, and various places of offerings, were allowed. Besides, a plurality of priests, altars, and sanctuaries, would very naturally lead to a plurality of gods, and thus all the evils of idolatry would be gradually introduced into the worship of the chosen people. The statute before us, requiring all their sacrifices to be presented at one place, was happily adapted to prevent these consequences.

The Eating of Blood forbidden.

10. *That eateth any manner of blood*. This prohibition is met with twice elsewhere in the Levitical law, Lev. 3. 17,—7. 26, besides its being found in the precepts of Noah, Gen. 9. 4. It is

11 ° For the life of the flesh *is* in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, ᵖ to make an atonement for your souls: for ᵠ it *is* the blood *that* maketh an atonement for the soul.

° ver. 14. ᵖ Matt. 26. 28. Mark 14. 24. Rom. 3. 25, and 5. 9. Ephes. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14, 20. Heb. 13. 12. 1 Pet. 1, 2. 1 John 1, 7 Rev. 1. 5. ᵠ Heb. 9. 22.

repeated again and again, and much stress laid upon it as a law that has more in it than would at first appear. The reason here annexed to it is considered below, in the note on the ensuing verse. It is to be remarked, however, that the blood of clean fishes, of locusts, and of creeping things, is understood by the Jews to be excepted from this prohibition.——¶ *I will even set my face against that soul*, &c. Heb. נתתי פני *nâthatti pânai, I will give my face.* Gr. *επιστησω το προσωπον μου.* Chal. 'I will set mine anger against the man.' The original word for 'face' is often used by the sacred writers for 'anger,' as may be seen by the following passages: Gen. 33. 20, 'I will appease him' (Heb. 'I will appease his *face*')' Lam. 4. 15, 'The *anger* (Heb. *face*) of the Lord hath divided them.' Jer. 3. 12, 'And I will not cause mine *anger* (Heb. *face*) to fall upon you.' 1 Pet. 3. 12, 'The *face* (i. e. anger) of the Lord is against them that do evil.'

11. *For the life of the flesh is in the blood.* Heb. כי נפש הבשר בדם הוא *ki nephesh habbâsâr baddom hi, for the life or soul of the flesh it is in the blood.* Gr. *ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτου ἐστιν, for the life or soul of all flesh is the blood thereof.* This was not perhaps intended to be affirmed as a strictly physiological fact, but simply to express what *appears* to be the truth, and what was popularly regarded as such. The seat of vitality was *ostensibly* in the blood, because if the blood was shed life became extinct. Yet it is not a little remarkable that the researches of modern anatomists and physiologists have brought them in the main to the same conclusion, namely, that the blood is actually possessed of a *principle of vitality.* This, it is said, is demonstrated by the following among other facts. If blood be taken from the arm in the most intense cold that the human body can suffer, it will raise the thermometer to the same height, as blood taken in the most sultry heat. Now it is known that *living bodies* alone have the power of resisting great degrees of heat and cold, and of maintaining in almost every situation, while in health, that temperature which we distinguish by the name of *animal heat.* But it is by no means necessary to insist on this as implied in the words of our text. The sacred scriptures have little to do with the *absolute verities* of natural science. These we are to ascertain from other sources, and establish by other evidence. See Note on Gen. 9. 4.——¶ *It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.* By transgression a man forfeits his *life* to divine justice, and he must die did not mercy provide him a substitute. The *life* of a beast is appointed and accepted by God as a substitute for the sinner's *life;* but as this *life* is in the *blood*, and as the *blood* is the grand principle of *vitality*, therefore the *blood* is to be poured out upon the altar, and thus the *life* of the beast becomes a substitute for the *life* of the man. But this was a typical ordinance, having direct reference to the atonement of Christ. Christ not only *died* for sinners, but our redemption is ever ascribed to his *blood:* for in order to make a satisfactory atonement, he not only bowed his head upon the cross and gave up the ghost, but his side was opened, the pericardium and the heart evidently pierced, that the vital fluid might be poured out from the very seat of life, and that thus the *blood* which is the life should be shed to make expiation for the *life* of the soul. The forbid-

12 Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood, neither shall any stranger that sojourneth among you eat blood.

13 And whatsoever man *there be* of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, which [r] hunteth and catcheth any beast or fowl that may be eaten; he shall even [s] pour out the blood thereof, and [t] cover it with dust.

14 [u] For *it is* the life of all flesh,

[r] ch. 7. 26. [s] Deut. 12. 16, 24, and 15. 23. [t] Ezek. 24. 7. [u] ver. 11, 12. Gen. 9. 4. Deut. 12. 23.

the blood of it *is* for the life thereof: therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh; for the life of all flesh *is* the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it shall be cut off.

15 [x] And every soul that eateth that which died *of itself*, or that which was torn *with beasts*, (*whether it be* one of your own country, or a stranger) [y] he shall both wash his clothes, [z] and bathe *himself* in

[x] Exod. 22. 31. ch. 22. 8. Deut. 14. 21. Ezek. 4. 14, and 44. 31. [y] ch. 11. 25. [z] ch. 15. 5.

ding the eating of blood therefore would naturally tend to beget a devout and reverent regard for that precious fluid which was visibly represented in the blood of the victims slain upon the Jewish altar.

12. *Therefore I said unto the children of Israel*, &c. Whatever other reasons might previously have existed for this prohibition (Gen. 9. 4), yet this is the reason why it is to be forbidden to the children of Israel, and to all that saw fit to adjoin themselves to the holy people.

Additional Precepts in regard to Blood and the Carcasses of Beasts.

13. *And whatsoever man there be*, &c. In this and the subsequent verses the law given above respecting the use of blood of sacrificed beasts is extended to that of all other creatures common for food, whether wild or tame, but especially such as were taken in hunting. The blood was to be carefully drained from the body, and decorously covered over with earth.——¶ *He shall even pour out the blood thereof and cover it with dust.* Lest it should be licked up by any other animal, which he would have them avoid, either because the taste of blood might generate a destructive thirst for it, or because he would not have any thing so *sacred* as blood exposed to profanation. The covering of the blood also conveyed the intimation that it should not be imputed as a matter of guilt to the shedder, as appears from the contrary, Job 16. 18, 'O earth, *cover* not thou my blood, and let my cry have no place.' Ezek. 24. 7, 8, 'For her blood is in the midst of her; she sets it upon the top of a rock; she poured it not upon the ground, to cover it with dust; that it might cause fury to come up to take vengeance; I have set her blood upon the top of a rock that it should not be covered;' where the blood not covered, signifies a crying to God for vengeance. The Jews regard this as a very weighty precept, and appoint that the blood should be covered with these words: 'Blessed is he that hath sanctified us by his precepts, and commanded us to cover blood.'

15. *That which died of itself, or that which was torn with beasts.* This is still but the application of the main law in regard to blood; for in both cases, the blood was retained in the body; hence the council at Jerusalem forbade things *strangled*, as well as *blood*; because in such beasts, the blood was coagulated in the veins and arteries. ——¶ *He shall wash his clothes.* In this case it is supposed that the person sinned ignorantly or through inadvertency, not of deliberation or set purpose; for any presumptuous sin was to be followed by exemplary judgments

water, and be unclean until the even: then shall he be clean.

16 But if he wash *them* not, nor bathe his flesh, then [a] shall he bear his iniquity.

[a] ch. 5. 1, and 7. 18, and 19. 8. Numb. 19. 20.

CHAPTER XVIII.

As the chosen and covenant tribes of Israel were soon to take up their journey to the land of Canaan, the inhabitants of which were to be exterminated for their multifarious iniquities in the sight of God, a recital is here made of some of those aggravated forms of wickedness which were rife among them, and which God had determined signally to punish. This is done not only to illustrate the justice of the divine proceedings in their excision, but also with a view to put the peculiar people themselves on their guard against yielding to the contagion of their pernicious example, and thus becoming obnoxious to the same fearful retributions which were now about to be visited upon the Canaanites. The particular class of abominations more especially pointed out in this chapter, and to which the brand-mark of the divine reprobation is so conspicuously affixed, is that of *incestuous connexions*. Not only had that abandoned race been guilty of a total apostacy from the worship of the true God, substituting in his room the sun, and moon, and host of heaven, and bowing down to stocks and stones and creeping things, but they had mingled with their idolatry every vice that could degrade human nature and pollute society. In the black catalogue of these, the abominations of lust stand pre-eminent; and whether in the form of adultery, fornication, incest, sodomy, or bestiality, they had now risen to a pitch of enormity which the forbearance of heaven could tolerate no longer, and of which a shuddering dread was to be begotten in the minds of the people of the covenant. And in order that no possible plea of ignorance or uncertainty might be left in their minds as to those connexions which were lawful and those which were forbidden, the Most High proceeds in the present and in the 20th chapter to lay down a number of specific prohibitions on this subject, so framed, as not only to include the extra-nuptial pollutions, which had prevailed among the heathen, but also all those incestuous unions which were inconsistent with the purity and sanctity of the marriage relation. Both classes of crimes we think are in fact included; so that it is doing no violence to the spirit of the text to regard it as containing a system of marriage-laws by which the peculiar people were ever after to be governed.

As this is the only passage in the compass of the whole Bible where any formal enactments are given on this subject, this and the connected chapters treating of this theme have always been deemed of peculiar importance in their relations to the question of the lawful degrees, within which the marriage connexion may now be formed by those who make the law of God the great standard of moral duty. But it is more especially with reference to the lawfulness of marriage with *a deceased wife's sister* that the bearings of this chapter become important to us under the gospel, and at the present time; as it is well known that the occurrence of cases of that kind has often greatly agitated the religious communions to which the parties belonged, and even at the present day, the difficulty of effecting an entire unanimity of sentiment among Christians appears as great as ever. We can scarcely expect, indeed, within the limits which the nature of the present work will allow, to bring the matter to a decisive issue, even if we were entirely confident on which side the truth lay, which we are forced to acknowledge we are

not. The just decision of the question necessarily involves the establishment of several great preliminary principles of interpretation, besides a display of the idiomatic usages of the Hebrew philologically exhibited, which cannot well be made satisfactory in a small compass. But as the subject is one on which the truth is perhaps to be reached only by the gradual accumulation of evidence, we venture with others to contribute our small quota of suggestion towards the solution of a very important point, not of criticism only, but also of casuistry.

It will probably be seen that our leanings are to the side of the *unlawfulness* of the connexion; but recent discussions have brought forth so strong an array of arguments in support of the opposite theory, that it seems, on the whole, no more than is due to the presentation of evidence on both sides, that we should at present hold our judgment in suspense, simply giving to the reader a succinct but faithful view of the principal reasonings relied upon by the advocates of each.

1. *The Meaning of the Phrase 'Near of Kin.'*

In the general enunciation of the law, v. 6, it is said, 'None of you shall approach to any that is *near of kin* to him to uncover their nakedness.' The original phrase is שאר בשרו *sheër besâro, remainder of his flesh*, whereas in other cases, though not numerous, the term employed to signify kindred is קרוב *kârob*, from קרב *kârab, to draw nigh*. Michaelis' remarks on the terms in question (Comment. L. of M. Art. 102), are as follows:—'If the reader wishes to know what these words etymologically signify, I shall here just state to him my opinion, but without repeating the ground on which it rests. *Sheër* means, (1.) *a remnant;* (2.) *the remnant of a meal;* (3.) *a piece of any thing eatable*, such as *flesh;* (4.) *a piece of any thing in general*. Hence we find it subsequently transferred to *relationship* in the Arabic language; in which, though with a slight orthographical variation, that nearest relation is called *Taïr* or *Thsäir*, whom the Hebrews denominate *Goël*. In this way, *Sheer*, even by itself, would signify a relation. *Basar*, commonly rendered *flesh*, is among the Hebrews equivalent to *body;* and may thence have been applied to signify relationship. Thus, *thou art my flesh, or body*, (Gen. 29. 14), means *thou art my near kinsman*. When both words are put together, *Sheer-basar*, they may be rendered literally *corporeal relation*, or by a half Hebrew phrase, *kinsman after the flesh*. In their derivation, there are no farther mysteries concealed, nor any thing that can bring the point in question to a decision; and what marriages Moses has permitted or commanded, we cannot ascertain from *Sheer-basar*, frequent and extensive as is its use in his marriage-laws: but must determine, from his own ordinances, in which he distinctly mentions what *Sheer-basar*, that is, what relations, are forbidden to marry.' That the ideal connexion of the term שאר *sheër*, with *flesh* is somewhat close is evident from the following instances; Ps. 73. 26, 'My *flesh* (שארי *sheëri*) and my heart faileth.' Ps. 78. 20, 'Can he give bread also? Can he provide *flesh* (שאר *sheër*) for his people? Prov. 5. 11, 'And thou mourn at the last when *thy flesh and thy body* (בשרך ושארך *besârka u-sheërëka*) are consumed,' where however the original for 'flesh' is בשר *bâsâr*, and שאר *sheër* is rendered by 'body.' In a few instances, out of the present connexion, it is rendered, as here, by 'kin' or 'kinsman,' as Lev. 21. 2, '*But for his kin that is near unto him* (לשארו הקרב *lishëro hakkârob ëlauv*), for his mother,' &c. Num. 27. 11, 'And if his father have no brethren, then ye shall give his inheritance unto *his kinsman that is next to him* (לשארו הקרב אליו *lishëro hakkârob ëlauv*), of his family,'

&c. The peculiar combination שאר בשר *sheër bâsâr, remainder of flesh*, occurs only in v. 16 of this chapter, and Lev. 25. 49, 'Either his uncle or his uncle's son may redeem him, or any that is *nigh of kin unto him* (משאר בשרו *mishsheër besaro*, any *of his remainder of flesh*).' The usage of the Greek in these cases is peculiar. It seems to be founded on the assumption, that the kindred here specified were *in the habit of living together*, as the term is invariably some form of οικειος *domestic*, including those of the same household. Thus v. 6, 'None of you shall approach to any that is *near of kin to him*.' Gr. προς παντα οικεια (oth. cop. οικειαν) σαρκος αυτου, *to any domestic (relation) of his own flesh*. V. 12, 'Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister; for she is thy father's *near kinswoman*.' Gr. οικεια γαρ πατρος σου εστι, *for she is the domestic (relation) of thy father*. So also v. 13, where mention is made of the mother's sister. And again, v. 17, 'For they are her *near kinswomen*.' Gr. οικειαι γαρ σου εισιν, *for they are thy domestic (relations)*.' The tacit reference is probably to the nomade mode of life, in which the tents of near relatives were pitched in the close vicinity of each other, and their inmates were in habits of the most unrestrained intercourse. Indeed Maimonides lays it down as the general ground and reason of the following prohibitions, that the parties here debarred from marriage are such as were so bound together in domestic intimacy, that unless marriage were strictly forbidden between them, a door would have been opened for scenes of the grossest corruption in the circle of families and kindred. This fact in regard to the different modes of social life prevailing among the ancient Hebrews and with us, is undoubtedly to be taken into account in the present discussion, and should be set down to the advantage of those who maintain that the present laws are not binding upon us.

But we return to the import of the expression before us, 'remainder of flesh.' The phraseology is somewhat peculiar, as conveying the idea of *nearness of kin*. The use of it in this sense probably arose from the fact that in the original institution of marriage, the parties were pronounced to be 'one flesh.' In this case, therefore, one might be said to be in relation to the other, the 'remainder of his or her flesh;' and nothing could give a more impressive idea of the sacred *nearness* and *oneness* constituted between the parties by the marriage compact. So a child born of such a union is a 'remainder of flesh' in respect to his parents, and his parents to him. Thus too a brother and sister, the offspring of the same parents, are the 'remainder of flesh' to each other; and this sense of the phrase is illustrated in the present connexion, vv. 12, 13, where the expression 'father's near kinswoman,' and 'mother's near kinswoman,' is in the original 'father's *remainder*,' and 'mother's *remainder*;' (Heb שאר *sheër, remainder*). So again, v. 17, 'They are her near *kinswomen* (שארה *sheërah, her remainder*).' It would seem, therefore, that the established version is not only true to the sense of the original, but also that the expression includes *all* the prohibited degrees which follow. They were *all* 'remainder of flesh' to each other, and no language could convey the idea of closer relationship. The distinction, therefore, often much insisted on in the construction of this law, between consanguinity and affinity, seems not to be recognized at all by the Holy Spirit. To the same conclusion we shall probably be brought by a correct view of the intrinsic nature of the marriage relation, as instituted by God himself. 'By marriage,' says Blackstone (Com. B. I. ch. 15, and note), 'the husband and wife are one person in law. Upon this principle of an union of person in husband and wife, depend almost all the legal rights, duties, and

disabilities that either of them acquire by marriage. The same degrees by affinity are prohibited. Affinity always arises by the marriage of one of the parties so related. As a husband is related by affinity to all the *consanguinei* of his wife, and *vice versa*, the wife to all the husband's *consanguinei*; for the husband and wife being considered one flesh, those who are related to the one by blood are related to the other by affinity. Therefore a man, after his wife's death, cannot marry her sister, aunt, or niece.' By pronouncing the parties that enter that connexion 'one flesh,' it would seem to have been the divine intention that marriage should be regarded, in the highest sense consistent with the distinct personality of the married, as constituting a *constructive unity of being in man and wife*. In confirmation of this we beg leave to introduce a note from a previous volume of this series of commentaries, on the words of the historian, Gen. 39. 10, relative to the solicitations of Potipher's wife to Joseph; 'And it came to pass, as she spake to Joseph day by day, that he hearkened not unto her, to lie by her, or to be with her.' 'This passage affords an instance of a very important shade of meaning being lost to the English reader by the translators' not having adverted to, perhaps not being acquainted with, the genuine force of the original. When we read that Joseph refused to hearken to his mistress's solicitations, or 'to be with her,' we naturally understand the meaning to be, that he declined being in her company, that he shunned her presence, and especially that he avoided, as much as possible, being alone with her. All this may indeed have been so; we think it very probable that it was; still this does not by any means represent the true sense of the original phrase. The 'or' is not found in the Hebrew, and its insertion in our translation prevents the precise drift of the writer from being apprehended. The true rendering results from the omission of the particle —'he hearkened not unto her to lie by her, to be with her'—and the import of 'being with her' unquestionably is, being united, and as it were identified with her, so as in a sense to co-exist with her by a constructive reciprocation of being. This sense is clearly developed by the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 6. 16, 17, 'What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot *is one body*? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined to the Lord *is one spirit*.' To *be with one*, therefore, in this sense, is, in the eye of the Scriptures, *to have a community of being*. This is the nature of the conjugal union, which is trenched upon and invaded by every act of unlawful commerce, such as that meditated by Potiphar's wife.'

If this be a well-founded view of the subject, we see not how to resist the inference, that a woman's father, mother, brother, and sister, become by marriage, in the divine estimation, the father, mother, brother, and sister of the man whom she marries, and so *vice versa*. It may indeed be objected to this, as Nicodemus objected to the doctrine of regeneration, that it is impossible to see how it can be. But the question is, *does not God say so?* And may he not, in the exercise of his sovereign authority, *declare* that such and such relations of a moral or covenant kind shall exist among his creatures, although they might seem to our short-sighted reason to contravene the laws of physical being? It will scarcely be denied, that notwithstanding the distinct personality of each individual of the human race, there yet exists some kind of economical or federal union between them and Adam, in consequence of which their relations to law and destiny are very materially affected. We see no necessity that such a relation should be a matter of personal consciousness. It is sufficient that it is a matter of divine testimony, and the truth or the fallacy of the position is to

be determined by a fair and legitimate construction of the record on the true sense of which the whole matter rests. So again it is clearly affirmed by the Apostle, Rom. 4. 11, 12, that there is a sense in which, to all that believe, Abraham becomes a father, though they be not of the circumcision, like his descendants after the flesh. This also is not a fact of personal consciousness, but of divine testimony, which we receive because, although the idea is one of rather a subtle nature, we cannot set aside the evidence on which it rests. In like manner may it not be possible that within certain limits defined by God, the relations formed by affinity shall be just as near and as sacred as those resulting from consanguinity?

For ourselves we know of no more interesting view of the marriage union, than that it creates to each of the parties a new circle of endeared relatives, bound together by ties which are never henceforth to be sundered. What a field is here opened for the extension of the tenderest charities and the sweetest sympathies of his life! What a multiplication of the cords which, by binding firmly together, strengthen the great brotherhood of man! This end is no doubt answered to a certain extent on the opposite theory, that the relationship with a wife's or husband's family ceases as soon as the one or the other is removed by death. But the tie will naturally be regarded of far slighter force when it is looked upon as merely temporary in its duration, and though a mutual friendly intercourse and interest may subsequently be kept up between the families, yet it is nothing compared with the cemented fellowship that subsists between those who regard each other in the light of *permanent kindred*.

It is also to be remarked, that the view now suggested of the nearness and sanctity of the marriage relation, would tend more powerfully perhaps than any other to counteract those lax and lawless sentiments in regard to that institution, which are unhappily at all times too prevalent among men, and which generate a dangerous facility in the procurement of divorces. The convictions upon which the sacredness and stability of marriage rest, need to be reinforced by every legitimate collateral influence which can be brought to bear upon them; and what can tend more to this than the consideration, that though the connexion itself might cease at death, yet the kindred created by it would survive and live on undisturbed?—But we pass on to another department of our preliminary discussions.

What is meant by the Phrase 'to Uncover Nakedness?'

This expression is evidently of the utmost importance in this connexion, as defining the criminal intercourse which is here forbidden. It is true, indeed, that the phraseology is occasionally varied in other parts of the law, as we find 'to approach to,' 'to lie with,' used as equivalents to the form of speech before us. The first of these, 'to approach to,' occurs only in v. 6 and 14 of the present chapter, in both which cases it is obviously tantamount to *having carnal connexion with a woman*. The second, 'to lie with,' in like manner, when employed without any thing to qualify or limit its meaning, has obviously the generic sense of *sexual intercourse*, whether within or without the pale of matrimony. It can scarcely be necessary to show, by an array of particular citations, that the import of these phrases fairly includes the sexual intercourse supposed in the very idea of marriage, as well as the illicit commerce to which the terms *fornication* and *adultery* are applied.

The question returns, then, whether the expression before us, 'to uncover nakedness,' is not used with equal latitude, including the conjugal intercourse of married parties, as well as the sexual connexion forbidden under the name of

incestuous fornication and adultery, for which many contend as the only object of prohibition in the laws now under consideration. For ourselves, we are ready to admit that something more is prohibited in these chapters than merely incestuous *marriages*. Not only the import of the terms, but the obvious drift of the law, as indicated by the circumstances under which it was promulgated, convince us that it was intended to interdict in general the various kinds of promiscuous sexual commerce which had prevailed among the abandoned heathen, and at the same time to embrace those incestuous marriage connexions to which many suppose the law has *exclusive* reference. But having made this admission, we again remark, that there is nothing in the form of the expression itself which precludes the sense of marriage connexions. Whatever else may be included in it, it is obvious that the sense of connubial intercourse is not *necessarily* shut out of its import. It is evidently a euphemistic mode of expression, to convey the idea of an act which the instinctive sentiments of delicacy among all people agree to shroud in language that shall rather *hint* than *declare*. But let us refer to the actual usage. In the present chapter the phrase occurs thirteen times; these instances it will not be necessary to cite. In the twentieth chapter, comprising, for the most part, a repetition of the precepts of this, with the annexed penalties, it occurs six times, but with no different shade of meaning. The next instance in which it occurs is found Is. 47. 2, 3, in an address to the 'virgin daughter of Babylon,' to whom it is said, 'Take the millstones and grind meal, &c.; thy *nakedness shall be uncovered*, yea, thy shame shall be seen.' Here is barely the implication of *unseemly exposure*, without any thing to aid us in determining the question of its drift in the connexion before us. The only remaining cases are the following, all occurring in Ezekiel. Ch. 16. 36, 'Because thy filthiness was poured out, and thy *nakedness discovered* (uncovered) through thy whoredoms with thy lovers,' &c. Here it is evident, from the context, that the allusion is to extra-conjugal licentiousness, of the grossest character. Thus again, v. 37, 'Behold, therefore, I will gather all thy lovers, with whom thou hast taken pleasure, and all them that thou hast loved, with all them that thou hast hated; I will even gather them round about against thee, and *will discover (uncover) thy nakedness unto them, that they may see all thy nakedness.*' This, of course, is not the uncovering that belongs to marriage. Ezek. 22. 10, 'In thee have they *discovered (uncovered) their fathers' nakedness:* in thee have they humbled her that was set apart for pollution.' This is entirely parallel to the use of the phrase in the chapter before us, and advances us no further towards a definite result. Ch. 23. 10, 'These *discovered (uncovered) her nakedness:* they took her sons and her daughters, and slew her with the sword.' There is no room to question the application of this language to the pollutions of illicit love. It is not a *nuptial nakedness* of which the prophet here speaks. Thus too again, ch. 23. 18, 'So she *discovered (uncovered) her whoredoms*, and *discovered (uncovered) her nakedness:* then my mind was alienated from her.' Once more, ch. 23. 29, 'And they shall deal with thee hatefully, and shall take away all thy labor, and shall leave thee naked and bare; and *the nakedness of thy whoredoms shall be discovered (uncovered)*, both thy lewdness and thy whoredoms.' The nakedness here uncovered, is expressly said to be that of 'whoredoms,' and consequently cannot be that of marriage.

These are all the cases in which the phrase occurs in the Bible, and the general result will doubtless be admitted to be, that although it is *incontestably* applied in several of the cited cases to

forbidden sexual intercourse, yet it is *not* equally indubitable that it is used to denote the lawful intercourse of wedlock. At the same time, as there is nothing in the native import of the terms employed, which should necessarily forbid its being thus used, and as nothing can be pointed out in the circumstances of its occurrence in the other cases which absolutely shuts us up to that as the only sense, we see not that any conclusive argument can be drawn from the terms of the law to restrict its prohibitions simply to acts of adultery and fornication. At any rate, it will scarcely be questioned, that in v. 18, the expression, 'Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness,' implies taking her in marriage, whether it be understood as before the death of the first wife or after. We observe moreover that the meaning of the terms is undoubtedly to be viewed in connexion with the scope of the law, and in proportion to the strength of evidence that the law before us does not contemplate merely the general enormities of adulterous intercourse, but the specific sin of incest in its several forms, in the same proportion is the certainty that in these passages the phrase in question conveys the idea of marriage.

What then is the ground for believing that *no other* than the crimes that came under the category of general lewdness are here forbidden? Can any sufficient reason be assigned, why the crime of adultery should here be forbidden with all this minute specification of cases, when it had been previously so expressly and so solemnly denounced by the terms of the seventh commandment? As *all* are necessarily included in the scope of that prohibition, why does the lawgiver here forbid only those cases of adultery which may take place with a mother, step-mother, sister, half-sister, sister-in-law, &c. 'What would be thought,' says Mr. Dwight, 'of the wisdom of a legislature which should enact a similar statute with regard to any other crime; for example, that of horse-stealing:—'He who steals the horse of any person shall be imprisoned three years. He who steals his father's horse, shall be imprisoned three years. He who steals his brother's horse, shall be imprisoned three years. He who steals the horse of his father's brother, shall be imprisoned three years,'—and so on through a succession of thirty-three relations.' Again, it is not to be forgotten that the established punishment for *adultery* was death. How comes it then, if adultery is the grand offence interdicted in this law, that the penalty, in several instances, is merely dying childless? On the whole, as any adequate reason for understanding solely the prohibition of adultery and fornication is wanting, and as the great mass of the Jewish and Christian world have agreed in interpreting these laws of incestuous marriages, it would seem that there are very strong grounds for this as the most legitimate construction. But though this be granted, still another question arises as to

The Sense of the word 'Wife' in this Connexion.

The position, as is well known, has been vigorously maintained, that as the word 'wife' and not 'widow' is the word uniformly employed in these laws, they must therefore be understood as referring to *women whose husbands were still living*. But to this it may be replied, that Hebrew usage in respect to terms expressive of these relations must be regarded. The original word rendered 'wife' is אִשָּׁה *ishah*, which is also the only term that the language affords for 'woman.' In like manner, the Gr. word γυνη signifies both 'woman' and 'wife.' In the Hebrew diction a man's 'wife' is uniformly his 'woman,' and nothing would be more natural, from the force of correct ideas on the subject of the marriage relation, than to speak of the surviving partner

of a man deceased as his 'woman' or 'wife.' That this was actually the usage is obvious from numerous examples. Thus Gen. 38. 8, 'And Judah said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brother's *wife*, and marry her.' Deut. 25. 5, 'The *wife of the dead* shall not marry without unto a stranger.' Ruth 4. 5, 'Buy it of Ruth, the *wife of the dead*.' 2 Sam. 12. 10, 'Thou hast taken the *wife* of Uriah.' Matt. 22. 25, 'The first died and left his *wife*.' Acts 5. 7, 'Ananias' *wife*, not knowing that her husband was dead,' &c.

Such was the common usage among the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans; and such is that of the French, the Germans, the Spanish, and the Italians, as well as of the English. In none of the versions of the Scriptures in these languages, is the word *widow* introduced in such cases. The Hebrew has indeed the word אלמנה *almonah*, signifying *widow*, but it is never used, as with us, in such a connexion as 'the *widow* of such an one',—'the *widow* of a father, brother, son,' &c. Instead of this, the fixed phraseology in such cases is always 'wife.' Its use is most prevalent in cases where the writer's object is to make the *state of widowhood*, as a state of desolation and weakness, peculiarly prominent. Thus Ex. 22. 22, 'Ye shall not afflict any *widow* or child.' Deut. 14. 29, 'The stranger, the fatherless, and the *widow* shall come and eat and be satisfied.' Job. 24. 3, 'They take the *widow's* ox for a pledge.' Such is the more common usus loquendi. Indeed, it is remarkable, that in several instances the word אשה *woman* or *wife*, is subjoined to אלמנה *almonah*, *widow*, equivalent to 'widow-woman' or 'widow-wife' in our language. Both terms are in these cases generally translated in our version, though occasionally the latter is omitted. Thus, 1 Kings 7. 14, 'He was a *widow's son* (בן אשה אלמנה *bën ishah almonah*, *son of a widow-wife*) of the tribe of Naphtali.' But wherever the phrase 'widow-woman' occurs, it is to be recollected, that according to the original idiom, 'widow-wife' is an equally proper rendering. We cannot doubt, therefore, that while the term 'wife' in this connexion is really used with such an extension of its import as to embrace the idea of 'widow,' it would at the same time have been entirely contrary to the prevailing idiom of the language to have employed that term. The truth is, if we mistake not, the term 'wife' in the different specifications of the law before us, is so used as to express the *continuity of the relation*, without any regard to the fact of the husband's death. Whether he were living or dead, it mattered not; the prohibition continued in full force; and that not only from the common usage of speech, but from the nature of the propinquity already established between the barred parties. We do do not mean by this that the relation so continued after the death of either of the parties, as to make it unlawful for the survivor to marry again; for in this particular, a dispensation was kindly granted, and the words of the apostle, Rom. 7. 2, 3, apply in all their force; 'For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband—so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.' But we do not perceive that this annuls the relationships previously existing between those who are brought together by affinity, nor is there any fairness in quoting the apostle's words to such a purpose, as his drift was entirely different. Take for instance the case of the step-mother, the father's wife. What originally constituted the propinquity between her and her step-son, that rendered it unlawful for him to marry her? Plainly the fact, that the father had consummated marriage with her. In the language of the law she then became 'one flesh' with him. As soon as this became a fact, the propinquity

became complete. How could the death of the father undo this pre-existent fact, and cause the constituted relation between the step-mother and the step-son to cease? So as to a sister; she does not lose the propinquity which she has in common with me, either at my father's death, or at her marriage; because her propinquity is founded on a pre-existent fact, which can never cease to be a fact. How then can we resist the inference, that the sister of a wife continues to be a sister, after the death of the wife, just as she was before, and consequently is *never* to be approached in the nuptial relation? Does the maxim admit of controversy, that any person, with whom, at *any time*, it would have been incest to cohabit, will *forever* remain forbidden? The question seems unequivocally determined by the principle of affinity arising out of the nature of the marriage union.

Are these Laws still binding upon Christians at the present Day?

This of course is a question of the utmost moment, in the present connexion. It is comparatively a matter of little consequence to ascertain whether the marriage in question was forbidden to the Jews, provided the statute respecting it was among those portions of the law which have been abolished under the gospel. This latter position is of course most strenuously maintained by those who hold to the lawfulness of the marriage in question. By them it is contended that these laws are purely ceremonial, forming a part of that code which is abrogated by Christ. They occur, it is said, in the midst of enactments which are confessedly Levitical, and accompanied by no notes of discrimination which mark them out as having a moral and permanent authority. For aught that appears, they are no more binding on us than the precepts relative to wearing linsey-woolsey garments, or sowing diverse seeds in the same field or raising a mixed breed of cattle. That code, as a code, has become to us antiquated, and if we receive certain of its moral precepts, it is not because we admit the authority of the Levitical law; but because of their own intrinsic equity or wisdom.

Again, it is affirmed, that if these enactments are binding upon us at this day, it must be because the connexions forbidden involve an essential immorality. But in this case, God never would have sanctioned them under any circumstances. Yet we perceive as a matter of fact, that the first marriages in the family of Adam must necessarily have been between *brother* and *sister*, so far at least as regards Cain and Abel, and probably Adam's other children. It was, moreover, an express statute, that in case that a brother died childless, the surviving brother was not only permitted, but required to marry his widow. If such connexions then are intrinsically wrong, how could they have been allowed in the instances cited?

To this it is replied, on the other hand, that there is nothing of a *ceremonial* nature in the law regulating marriage connexions. The institution of marriage was intended, not for the Jews but for the whole world. As such, the laws by which its Author has seen fit to qualify, guard, and govern it, are binding alike upon all nations and in all times. These laws are contained in the chapters before us; and if they are not now obligatory, then it follows that we have nothing in the compass of the whole Bible regulating the subject of marriage alliances—nothing to forbid a man marrying his own mother, sister, or daughter! They occur, indeed, in the midst of a multitude of enactments, peculiar to the Levitical economy. But this is no more than holds good of a vast variety of other moral precepts, the universally binding nature of which no one questions. The moral law is indeed summarily comprised in the decalogue, yet the letter and spirit of

this divine code are illustrated and confirmed by subsequent explanatory precepts, which are interminglied often in the same chapter, and sometimes in the same paragraph with the purely ritual or ecclesiastical laws. One has only to turn his eye over the three or four connected chapters in this book, to find the repeated occurrence of such precepts as the following:—'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.'—'Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God; him shalt thou serve, and to him shalt thou cleave, and swear by his name.'—'Thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord.'—'Thou shalt worship no other God.'—'Ye shall keep my Sabbath, and reverence my sanctuary.'—'Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart.'—'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'—'Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child.'—'Thou shalt not arrest judgment, thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift.'—'That which is altogether just shalt thou follow.'—'Thou shalt have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure shalt thou have.'—'Thou shalt keep the commandments of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways and to fear him.'

No one can imagine for a moment that these precepts are *ceremonial* and binding on the Jews only. Many of them are expressly cited and applied in the New Testament. But if they were not, still their authority remains unabated. The books of the Old Testament are received by all Christians as inspired volumes, and they hesitate not to accept its moral and ethical code as equally binding with that of the New. As every other command of the decalogue is recognized and fortified by particular precepts here and there interspersed, the same may be expected, a priori, in regard to the seventh. That command preserved the honor of the marriage union after it was formed; but it left many questions undecided respecting the parties who might lawfully enter wedlock. It was extremely important to be made known whether the ordinance was left free, without any restraint or limits, or whether there were any prohibitions on the score of degrees of kindred. There must be a law somewhere in the Mosaic code to ascertain who may and who may not be united in marriage. Where shall that law be found, if not in the chapters before us; and if found there, what reason can be urged for its having become obsolete? Are we to be driven to the alternative of admitting that we are left without a single passage or paragraph in the whole compass of revelation bearing upon the degrees of relationship within which marriage may or may not be contracted?

Again, the connexions forbidden in these statutes are those which are pronounced abominable in the depraved Canaanites and Egyptians. But what could have rendered incest a crime among these abandoned heathen? They had not the written law, and where there is no law there is no transgression. If the prohibitory code was peculiar only to the Jews, what binding power could it have upon the Gentiles, who were strangers to the Jews? What was the law which, in this matter, they had transgressed? There surely must have been some flagrant infraction of the mandates of heaven, to draw down such dire denunciations, and such wasting judgments as are spoken of in this connexion. Vv. 24, 25, 'Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.' What can account for the severity of this judgment but the fact, that in perpetrating these enormities, they were transgressing a moral code—a law which, as it was in force *before* the existence of the

Mosaic dispensation, so it is equally in force *after* it, even in our own land and all future time. That there has been no repeal of the law under the New Testament, is plain from the two instances which are mentioned but to be condemned. When John reproved Herod for taking his brother's Philip's wife, and lost his life for his fidelity, his denunciation was but an echo of the direct language of the word of God as here recorded; and the horror expressed by Paul at a man's taking his father's wife, an offence not so much as named among the Gentiles, goes unequivocally to prove that he knew nothing of any abrogation of the law of incest.

As to the objection brought from the case of marriages in Adam's family, and from that of the brother's widow who was childless, we adopt the reply given by Prof. Hodge (Bib. Rep. July, 1842). 'It is obvious the argument proves too much. If the command that one brother should take the childless widow of another brother as his wife, proves that it is not wrong for a man to marry his sister-in-law, then the command to the immediate sons of Adam to marry their sisters, proves that it is right now for brothers to marry their sisters. This objection is founded upon the confusion of two very different things. There are things which are inherently and essentially wrong, and can in no possible case be right; as hatred of God and malevolence towards men. The prohibitions of such things arise out of the very nature of God, and are as immutable as that nature. But there are other things which are wrong only in virtue of a divine prohibition; and this prohibition may be founded either on temporary considerations, or such as are permanent. But in either case, whenever the prohibition is removed or the opposite commanded, the guilt of the action ceases. It was a sin in any Israelite not to circumcise his child on the eighth day; but if God commanded any one to defer the rite or omit it altogether, it was of course his duty to comply. It was forbidden to the Hebrews to labor on the Sabbath, but in many cases, labor on that day was a duty. These are cases of positive commands. But further than this, it is sinful to take the property of others without their consent, but if God commanded the Israelites to take the property of the Egyptians, it was right for them to do so. It is a sin to kill a human being, yet God commanded the Hebrews to extirpate the Canaanites. We all admit that bigamy is a sin, but if any man will produce a command of God to marry two wives, no one will deny his right to do so. It is a sin for a brother to marry his sister, but if required by a divine command, it is a sin no longer. Thus, also, if any one can produce a divine command to marry his sister-in-law, the lawfulness of the marriage will be readily admitted. All these commands belong to the same class; they all express the will of God as to the duties of men in the permanent relations of society, and are therefore of permanent obligation; yet any one or all of them may be set aside by him in whose hands are all his creatures, and whose nature and relations, and the resulting duties, may be modified at will. That an Israelite, therefore, under peculiar circumstances and for specified reasons was commanded to marry his brother's wife, no more proves that the general law on this subject is not binding, than the command to Abraham to sacrifice Isaac proves that the command, thou shalt not kill, is not moral and permanent. That the Levitical law of marriage is still binding upon us, we think is proved by what has already been said. It is the expression of the will of God in reference to relationships which still exist among men. It tells us what is the duty of near relatives. It tells us that brothers and sisters must not intermarry, not because they were Jews, but because of their relationship. It extends the prohibition to

all who are near of kin, because they are near of kin. It is as much a law for us therefore as any other expression of the will of God. The binding authority of this law is recognized in the New Testament, just as the continued obligation of the original law of marriage is recognized. We find no express assertion that marriage must be between one man and one woman, but the expression of the will of God at the creation, is held to bind all ages and nations. Thus, though there is no express declaration that near relatives must not marry, it is plain from the language of the apostle to the Corinthians, that he considered the original revelation on this subject as still our rule of duty.'

Do these Laws include Degrees not expressly Specified?

The consideration of this question we may introduce in the words of Michaelis, subjoining his own opinion on it.

'There arises the question, Whether Moses only prohibits the marriages which he expressly mentions, or others beside not mentioned, where the degree of relationship is the same? This question, which is of so great importance in the marriage-laws of Christian nations, and which from an imperfect knowledge of oriental customs has been the subject of so much controversy, properly regards the following marriages, viz.:—

1. With a brother's daughter.
2. With a sister's daughter.
3. With a maternal uncle's widow.
4. With a brother's son's widow.
5. With a sister's son's widow.
6. With a deceased wife's sister

'These marriages we may, perhaps, for brevity's sake, be allowed to denominate *the six marriages*, or *the consequential marriages*. They are as near as those which are prohibited. Moses never mentions them in his marriage statutes, yet the ground of his prohibitions is nearness of relationship. The question, therefore, is, Are these marriages to be or not to be considered as prohibited by just inference from the letter of his laws?

'In my opinion *they are not*.

'My reasons for denying and protesting against the conclusions are the following:

'1. Moses does not appear to have framed or given his marriage-laws with any view to our deducing, or acting upon conclusions which we might think fit to deduce from them: for if this was his view, he has made several repetitions in them which are really very useless. What reason had he, for example, after forbidding marriage with a father's sister, to forbid it also with a mother's, if this second prohibition was included in the first, and if he meant, without saying a word on the subject, to be understood as speaking, not of particular marriages, but of degrees?

'2. Moses has given his marriage-laws in two different places of the Pentateuch, viz.: in both the 18th and 20th chapters of Leviticus; but in the latter of these passages we find only the very same cases specified which had been specified in the former. Now had they been meant merely as examples of degrees of relationship, it would have been more rational to have varied them; and if it had been said, for instance, on the first occasion, *Thou shalt not marry thy father's sister*, to have introduced, on the second, the converse case, and said, *Thou shalt not marry thy brother's daughter*. This, however, is not done by Moses, who in the second enactment just specifies the father's sister as before, and seems, therefore, to have intended that he should be understood as having in his view no other marriages than those which he expressly names; unless we choose to interpret his laws in a manner to his own meaning and design.'

It can scarcely be maintained that there is any thing conclusive in either

of these remarks. As to the repetitions, we need to know more respecting the actual condition and social usages of the peculiar people before we can pronounce them to be useless. So also as to varying the specifications in the 18th and 20th chapters. We are not competent to say, *a priori*, what method of laying down these statutes was the most proper; and we are always upon dubious ground in holding it to be 'rational to expect' that the word of God should be constructed in any different manner from what it is.

The *fact* is, that certain express prohibitions are contained in these chapters, and the *question* is, whether, on legitimate principles of interpretation, certain other prohibitions touching degrees of kindred precisely similar are not also involved. As to the marriage with a deceased wife's sister, it is admitted that we do not find it in so many words forbidden. But we find the parallel case of the brother's widow forbidden, and as the relation is the same, it is contended that by parity of reasoning the former also must be understood to be forbidden. The inference is held to be unimpeachable for the reason that *the degree of relationship is the very ground of the prohibitions.* A man must not marry his half-sister, *because* she is his sister; a man must not marry his aunt, *because* she is the near relative of his father or mother; a man must not marry his brother's wife, *because* she is so nearly related to his brother; a man must not marry the daughter or grand-daughter of his wife, '*because* they are her near kinswomen; it is wickedness.' Relationship to his wife is the very ground of the prohibition. The law itself, therefore, both in its general statement, and in its particular specifications, gives the rule of its own interpretation. It is the degree of kindred which the law itself teaches us is to be considered. Shall we say then that a marriage coming within the scope of any of these prohibitions, is not contrary to the mind of God? Shall God say that two brothers shall not marry the same woman, because it is an unclean and wicked thing for such near kindred as a brother-in law and a sister-in-law to marry; and shall we say this law allows two sisters to marry the same man, although thereby a brother-in-law and sister-in-law intermarry? Are not two sisters as 'near of kin' to each other as two brothers are? And is not a sister-in-law just as near of kin to her brother-in-law in the one case as in the other? And is not nearness of kin the entire ground of all the prohibitions?

Besides, the principle that no one is bound by any thing which is not expressly affirmed—that no *constructive* or *inferential* duties are taught in the Scriptures—would seem to be one that leads to the most dangerous results. If the principle of *inference* or *implication* is not to be employed in the interpretation, then it follows that a man may lawfully marry his own daughter, for this is nowhere expressly forbidden. If *inferences* are not binding in the interpretation of the divine law, then we would ask for the *express* command which was violated by Nadab and Abihu in offering strange fire, and which cost them their lives? Any prohibition in set terms on that subject will be sought for in vain. So again, did not our Saviour tell the Sadducees that they *ought to have inferred* that the doctrine of the resurrection was true, from what God said to Moses at the bush? When it is expressly declared, moreover, that 'whosoever stealeth a man and selleth him shall surely be put to death,' is it an unfair inference that he that stole a *woman* or a *child* was to be subjected to the same punishment? On the whole it seems necessary to admit, that as the law makes nearness of kin the sole criterion by which to determine whether a given marriage be lawful or not, therefore if it declares a degree of nearness of kin in any one case so great as to

CHAPTER XVIII.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, [a] I *am* the LORD your God.

[a] ver. 4. Exod. 6. 7. ch. 11. 44, and 19. 4, 10, 34, and 20. 7. Ezek. 20. 5, 7, 19, 20.

3 [b] After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and [c] after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances.

[b] Ezek. 20. 7, 8, and 23. 8. [c] Exod. 23. 24. ch. 20. 23. Deut. 12. 4, 30, 31.

render marriage unlawful, it virtually declares an equal degree of propinquity in another case to be an effectual bar to marriage.

As the ensuing notes will resume the consideration of various details connected with the subject, it will be unnecessary to prolong our introductory remarks. To those who would extend their inquiries more minutely into the essential merits of the question, the following authorities may be indicated as covering very nearly the whole ground. Selden de Uxore Hebraica.—The Cases of Marriages between Near Kindred, particularly considered with respect to the Doctrine of Scripture, the Law of Nature, and the Laws of England. By John Fry. Lond. 1756 (a work of rare occurrence).—Pres. Edward's (the Younger) Works, vol. 2. Serm. 7.—Rev. Dr. B. Trumbull's Appeal to the Public relative to the Unlawfulness of Marrying a Wife's Sister.—Rev. Dr. J. H. Livingston's Dissertation on the Marriage of a Man with his Sister-in-law.—Christian Magazine, vol. 4. p. 80, &c. A Brief Inquiry into the Lawfulness of Marrying a deceased Wife's Sister.—Rev. S. E. Dwight's Hebrew Wife; or the Law of Marriage examined in relation to the Lawfulness of Polygamy, and to the Extent of the Law of Incest.—Marshall's Review of the preceding work of Dwight.—Rev. C. M'Ivers's Essay concerning the Unlawfulness of a Man's Marriage with his Sister by Affinity.—To the above we may add two very able discussions of the subject in a more ephemeral form, both advocating the lawfulness of the marriage in question, the one published in the New York Observer of Aug. 6, 1842, the other a series of six letters published in the New England Puritan, in the months of July and August, 1842. The report also of the discussions in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of 1842, contained in the New York Observer of June 11, and in the Princeton Biblical Repertory of July, 1842, embody a large mass of valuable argument on the general subject, the substance of all of which is well worthy of being preserved in more permanent form.

General Preface to the Marriage Laws.

1. *Say unto them, I am the Lord your God.* These words constitute the grand authoritative sanction of all the ensuing laws, implying that they respect a matter of the utmost importance, one in which the honor and glory of the great God were most deeply involved. Although the God of all, he was in a special and emphatic sense the God of the nation of Israel, with whom they were in covenant, whom they professed to serve, and to whom they were under the greatest obligations imaginable. The phrase occurs six times in the present chapter, and still oftener in the next.

3. *After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do.* Heb. מִמַּעֲשֵׂה *kemaäsëh, according to the doing or practising.* Gr. κατα τα επιτηδευματα, *according to the customs, usages, institutes.* To what extent the crimes here forbidden prevailed among these heathen nations, may be learned from various intimations scattered here and there through the Scriptures, and

4 [d]Ye shall do my judgments, and keep mine ordinances, to walk therein; I *am* the LORD your God.

5 Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments: [e]which if a man do, he shall live in them: [f]I *am* the LORD.

6 ¶ None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him,

[d] Deut. 4. 1, 2, and 6. 1. Ezek. 20. 19.
[e] Ezek. 20. 11, 13, 21. Luke 10. 28. Rom. 10. 5. Gal. 3. 12.
[f] Exod. 6. 2, 6, 29. Mal. 3. 6.

from the records of profane history. Upon these we cannot afford the space to dwell at any length; especially as it is more important for our present purpose to call attention to the fact, that these nations, in committing these abominations, *sinned*. But against what law? Where there is *no* law there is no transgression; and as neither the Egyptians nor the Canaanites were in possession of the Mosaical code, it would seem to follow of necessity, that the practices here forbidden were violations of some more primitive law than the ceremonial institute of the Jews; and consequently that *they*, in being guilty of them, would be transgressing not merely a set of positive precepts delivered by the hand of Moses, but also that moral constitution which had been in force from the earliest ages of the world;—in a word, that the marriages here forbidden were *always* regarded as incestuous, and are therefore *always* unlawful.——¶ *Neither shall ye walk in their ordinances.* Heb. בחקתיהם *behukkothëhem;* that is, their laws, statutes, or institutions; for so are their iniquitous customs called, which by general prevalence and countenance had become so inveterate, and so deeply rooted and grounded in the corrupt affections of all classes, that they had come to be regarded in the light, and to possess all the force, of so many laws and solemn institutions. This laid their abettors open to the woe denounced against those who 'decreed unrighteous decrees, and who 'framed mischief by a law.' Indeed, it is possible that the word may have respect to *positive enactments;* yet whatever they may have been, the purport of the precept to the Israelites is, 'Do ye not after the manner of these nations, although their conduct may be allowed by the settled laws of their country; for ye ar not to regard their practices any the more justifiable on that account;' thus teaching us, that neither common usage nor statute law can sanctify that which is in itself wrong.

4. *Ye shall do my judgments*, &c. Peculiar emphasis is here to be put upon the word 'my,' which is equivalent to 'mine only;' as the phrase 'Him shalt thou serve,' Deut. 6. 13, is expounded by our Savior, 'Him *only* shalt thou serve,' Mat. 4. 10.

5. *Which if a man do he shall live in them.* Rather, 'shall live by them.' This the ancient versions and commentators generally understood as equivalent to 'Shall have eternal life.' Thus the Chal. 'Shall live by them to life eternal.' So also Solom. Jarchi, 'Shall live in the world that is to come.' But as the term 'life,' 'living,' or 'to live,' is frequently used in the Scriptures to denote living happily, prosperously, and free from calamity, the probability is, that it is to be so taken in the passage before us. He shall in consequence of this his obedience be favored to enjoy a long and happy life, whereas by disobedience he shall be exposed to be judicially cut off. The apostle contrasts this legal promise made to works, with the gospel promise made to faith, Gal. 3. 11, 12. Rom. 10. 5–9.

General Law of Incest.

6. *None of you shall approach*, &c. Heb. איש איש לא תקרבו *ish ish lo tikrebu, man, man, ye shall not approach;* i. e. none of you. The phrase

to uncover *their* nakedness: I *am* the LORD.

7 g The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not uncover: she *is* thy mother, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.

g ch. 20. 11.

is taken in a wide sense by the Talmudists, as equivalent to neither Jew nor Gentile; for all mankind, they affirm, are comprehended under these laws of incest. Indeed the Kuraite Jews, the most strenuous advocates for a strict interpetation, and the most decided opponents to Talmudical comments, insist upon this as the true sense. The original term is 'approach,' frequently used by way of euphemism, to convey the idea of sexual intercourse, as in Gen. 20. 4, 'Abimelech *had not come near* (לֹא קָרַב *lo karab*) unto her.' Is. 8. 3, 'And I *went in unto* (אֶקְרַב *ekrab*) the prophetess, and she conceived,' &c. Comp. Ezek. 18. 6. In the particular precepts following in this chapter and in the twentieth chapter, this prohibited intercourse is pointed out by the phrases 'to uncover the nakedness,' 'to take,' and 'to lie with.' The first phrase therefore has the same meaning with each of the other three; and they of course with each other. In Lev. 18. 14, the phrase 'to uncover the nakedness' is explained by the phrase 'to approach to;' in Lev. 20. 11, by the phrase 'to lie with,' and in Lev. 20. 21, by the phrase 'to take.' These four phrases then, as used in this law, have precisely the same meaning. And if it be asked how far that meaning extends, we answer, to *every kind* of sexual intercourse, but especially that of *marriage*. There is nothing in either of the above phrases which limits its application to fornication and adultery rather than to marriage; and the general usage, as to the above phrases in the Scriptures abundantly confirms this position. 'To uncover the nakedness' is used in several instances (Lev. 18. 18, 1 Sam. 20. 30, Is. 57. 8), to denote conjugal intercourse, and the Heb. לָקַח *lāka'h*, *to take*, when connected with אִשָּׁה *ishah*, *woman*, or used absolutely, is the appropriate term for *to marry a wife*.——¶ *To any that is near of kin to him.* - Heb. אֶל כָּל שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ *el kol sheër besaro, to all (any) remainder of his flesh*, implying that in the relations about to be specified the parties were, in the economy of heaven's institution, so intimately united or rather identified, that the one was, as it were, the *remainder* of the other. In this case, therefore, the Most High lays down this *nearness of kin* as the foundation of all the following prohibitions, and then proceeds to state and determine, by his own sovereign authority, between whom that nearness of kin subsists. In the interpretation of what follows it is important to bear in mind, that although these prohibitions are principally addressed to the *man*, yet they are equally binding upon the *woman*, who stands in the same degree of relationship.

Incest forbidden with one's own Mother.

7. *The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother.* Heb. עֶרְוַת *ervah*, from עָרָה *ârâh*, *to be made naked*. Gr. *ασχημοσυνη*, *shame, uncomeliness*. The particle *or* in this verse should undoubtedly be rendered 'even,' as these words are designed to express a principle which lies at the foundation of this whole system of marriage laws: viz., *that husband and wife are put for one and the same thing, are completely identified;* 'they being no more twain but one flesh.' This is clear from what follows, 'she is thy mother;' showing that the mother's nakedness only is meant, though it is called the father's, as in Deut. 27. 20, 'Cursed be he that lieth with his father's wife; because he uncovereth his father's skirt,' i. e. his mother's. The nakedness of the one therefore is the nakedness of the other;

8 [h] The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover: it *is* thy father's nakedness.

[h] Gen. 49. 4. ch. 20. 11. Deut. 22. 30, and 27. 20. Ezek. 22. 10. Amos 2. 7. 1 Cor. 5. 1.

and he that marries his wife's brother's daughter does the same thing as if he married his own brother's daughter. The crime of Lot's daughters was a transgression of the precept contained in this verse. The parallel passage in ch. 20. 11, is, 'The man that lieth with his father's wife hath uncovered his father's nakedness; both of them shall surely be put to death.' The Hebrew canonists say on this precept, 'He that lieth with his mother, and she his father's wife, is doubly guilty, whether it be while his father is living or after his death; first, for that she is his mother, and secondly, that she is his father's wife.'—*Maimonides in Ainsworth.* It is to be remarked also that the Targum of Jonathan supposes the parallel case of the woman with her father to be implied;—'The woman shall not lie with her father, and the man shall not lie with his mother.' This is important, as indicating that the Jews considered the *relations of the same degree* as virtually included in each of these precepts. What is forbidden to men is forbidden also to women standing in the same relation, though the former only are mentioned.

According to the above,
A Man may not marry his
Mother,
Daughter:*
Nor a Woman her
Son,
Father.

With a Step-mother.

8. *The nakedness of thy father's wife shall thou not uncover.* This case differs from the preceding only in its being designed to embrace one's *step-mother*, as well as his *own mother*. The divine lawgiver would, by the most minute specification, preclude the possibility of mistake in regard to the meaning of a statute aimed against such a horrid impiety as a man's having illicit connexion with his mother. It was the incest here forbidden in this precept, of which Reuben was guilty with Bilhah, Gen. 35. 22, and Absalom with the wives of his father David, 2 Sam. 16. 21, 22. We learn also from the apostle, 1 Cor. 5. 1, that this was a sin held infamous by the very heathen. The Hebrew writers speak thus on this subject: 'A man's father's wife, and his son's wife, and his brother's wife, and his father's brother's wife, are unlawful for him for ever; whether they be of the betrothed or the married, whether divorced or not divorced, whether their husbands be alive or dead; except in the case of the brother's wife who hath left no child, Deut. 25. 5. If he lie with any of them while her husband is alive, he is doubly guilty; first, in respect that she is of his near kin, and, secondly, that she is another man's wife.'—*Maimonides.*——¶ *It is his father's nakedness.* That is, on the principle of *constituted identity* between the parties, as explained in the note on the preceding verse. This principle is recognized again in like manner in v. 14, where the uncovering of an uncle's nakedness is explained as the 'approaching to his wife.'

Results.
A Man may not marry his
Step-mother,
Step-daughter,
Daughter-in-law,
Mother-in-law:
Nor a Woman her
Step-son,
Step-father,
Father-in-law,
Son-in-law.

* The implied cases are italicized.

9 [1] The nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father, or daughter of thy mother, *whether she be* born at home, or born abroad, *even* their nakedness thou shalt not uncover.

10 The nakedness of thy son's daughter, or of thy daughter's daughter, *even* their nakedness thou shalt not uncover: for theirs *is* thine own nakedness.

11 The nakedness of thy father's wife's daughter, begotten of thy father, (she *is* thy sister) thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.

[1] ch. 20. 17. 2 Sam. 13. 12. Ezek. 22. 11.

With a Sister.

9. *The nakedness of thy sister*, &c.—*whether she be born at home, or born abroad.* Heb. מולדת בית או מולדת חוץ *moledeth bayith o moledeth hutz, the birth or offspring of the house, or the birth or offspring (from) abroad.* Chal. 'Which is begotten by the father, of another woman, or by the mother, of another man.' So Targ. Jon. 'Whom thy father hath begotten of another woman or of thy mother; or whom thy mother hath borne by thy father or by another man.' The scope of the precept undoubtedly is to forbid connexion between a brother and sister, whether such sister were born in lawful wedlock or out of it. The penalty annexed to this particular form of incest is thus stated, ch. 20. 17: 'And if a man shall take his sister, his father's daughter, or his mother's daughter, and see her nakedness, and she see his nakedness: it is a wicked thing; and they shall be cut off in the sight of their people: he hath uncovered his sister's nakedness; he shall bear his iniquity.'

Results.

A Man may not marry his
Sister:
Nor a Woman her
Brother.

With a Grand-daughter.

10. *The nakedness of thy son's daughter*, &c. The connexion forbidden is too express to need any particular explanation. We may quote, however, the remark of Maimonides in respect to it;—'Whoso companieth with a woman (even) by way of fornication, and begetteth a daughter of her, that daughter is forbidden to him in the name of his daughter. And though it be not said in the law, Thou shalt not uncover thy daughter's nakedness, yet this is because it forbiddeth the daughter's daughter; therefore it keepeth silence concerning the daughter, which yet is forbidden by the law (i. e. by the spirit of the law), and not by the scribes only.' Other Rabbinical writers hold the same language. They say that incest with a man's own daughter is not prohibited, because it would be irresistibly inferred. If a grand-daughter, standing in a degree more remote from him, is forbidden to his approach, surely his own daughter must in the nature of the case be prohibited. And if it could be said of a son's or daughter's daughter, 'Her's is thine own nakedness,' how much more emphatically could it be said of an own daughter?

Results.

A Man may not marry his
Grand-daughter,
Grand-mother:
Nor a Woman her
Grand-father,
Grand-son.

With a Half-sister by the Father's side.

11. *The nakedness of thy father's wife's daughter, begotten of thy father.* Heb. מולדת אביך *moledeth abika, the birth, generation, or offspring of thy father*, the same word as that rendered 'born,' in v. 9. It is by no means an easy matter to determine the precise point of difference between the prohibition in this verse and that in v. 9 Perhaps we can hit upon no construction

12 [k] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister: she *is* thy father's near kinswoman.

13 Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister:

[k] ch. 20. 19.

for she *is* thy mother's near kinswoman.

14 [l] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother, thou shalt not approach to his wife: she *is* thine aunt.

[l] ch. 20. 20.

---

nearer the truth than the following:—The 9th verse contains a general precept forbidding a man to marry his sister, either 'the daughter of his father born at home,' i. e. his sister-german, or full sister, by father or mother; or 'the daughter of his mother, born abroad;' i. e. his half-sister by the mother's side, and by another father. In the 11th verse a man is forbidden to marry a half-sister by his father's side. The Gr. understands by the sister here mentioned, *αδελφη ὁμοπατρια, a sister by the same father*, and with this the Chal. agrees. After all we must leave the matter involved in a considerable degree of obscurity, as does Michaelis, who suggests that it *may* perhaps be intended as an illustration of v. 9, and that it was inserted with a view to describe the marriage in which Abraham lived in different words, and to prohibit it a second time, lest, by reference to Abraham's example, the first statute should have been falsely explained. For the Results see under v. 9. The two passages together forbid marriage between a brother and a sister, both of the whole and the half-blood.

With a Paternal Aunt.

12 *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister.* Whether we are to understand here the full sister only or the half sister also, is a matter left undecided. By the Jewish commentators, both are held to be included, and they maintain also that it made no difference whether she were legitimately or illegitimately begotten by his grandfather. Selden informs us that such marriages were prohibited by the ancient Romans, although it would seem that, previous to the Mosaic law, they were at least occasionally practised by the Hebrew nation, for it is generally admitted that Moses himself was the offspring of this very connexion between his father Amram and his aunt Jochebed, Ex. 6. 20.——¶ *She is thy father's near kinswoman.* Heb. שאר אביך הוא *sheĕr abika hi, she is thy father's remainder.* Gr. *οικεια γαρ πατρος σου εστι, she is the domestic (relation) of thy father.* So near, that as he could not be permitted to marry her, so the like interdict was laid upon his son also, who was but little further removed. And for the same reason that a man could not lawfully marry his aunt, it seems also to follow that he could not marry his niece—a principle of interpretation on the justness of which we have already remarked.

Results.

A Man may not marry his
Aunt,
Niece:
Nor a Woman her
Nephew,
Uncle.

With a Maternal Aunt.

13. *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister.* For this the reason is the same as for the former prohibition; the aunt by the mother's side being as near as the aunt by the father's.——¶ *She is thy mother's near kinswoman.* Heb. שאר אמך הוא *sheĕr immeka hi, she is thy mother's remainder.* Gr. *οικεια γαρ μητρος σου εστι, she is the domestic (relation) of thy mother.*

Results.

Same as under preceding verse.

With a Paternal Uncle's Wife.

14. *Thou shalt not uncover the na-*

15 [m] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter-in-law: she *is* thy son's wife, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.

[m] Gen. 38. 18. 26. ch. 20. 12. Ezek. 22. 11.

16 [n] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it *is* thy brother's nakedness.

[n] ch. 20. 21. Matt. 14. 4. See Deut. 25. 5. Matt. 22. 24. Mark 12. 19.

kedness of thy father's brother. That is, as appears from what follows, of thy father's brother's *wife;* called *his* nakedness, because man and wife are considered and termed 'one flesh.' See Note on v. 8. By parity of reasoning, it is to be inferred, that the uncle was precluded from marrying his brother's daughter. The Hebrew canonists also maintain that although the *father's* brother's wife only is mentioned, yet the prohibition fairly embraces the *mother's* brother's wife in like manner. ——¶ *Thou shalt not approach.* Heb. לֹא תקרב *lo tikrâb.* Gr. ουκ εισελευση, *thou shalt not go in unto;* i. e. have carnal connexion with.

Results.

A Man may not marry his
Uncle's Wife,
Wife's Niece,
Nephew's Wife,
Wife's Aunt.
Nor a Woman her
Husband's Nephew,
Aunt's Husband,
Husband's Uncle,
Niece's Husband.

With a Daughter-in-law.

15. *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter-in-law.* The Heb. כלה *kallâh* is in several instances elsewhere used to signify a *spouse* or *bride,* and it is here rendered by the Gr. νυμφη, of the same signification. But the next clause makes it clear that 'son's wife' is meant, on which relation see Note on v. 8. It mattered not, according to the Rabbins, whether she had been fully married to the son, or only espoused; or whether she had been married, and been afterwards divorced. Under any circumstances, she was unlawful to him. The prohibition with the penalty is thus repeated, Lev. 20. 12, 'And if a man lie with his daughter-in-law, both of them shall surely be put to death: they have wrought confusion; their blood shall be upon them.'

Results.

See under v. 8.

With a Brother's Wife.

16. *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife.* This prohibition is repeated ch. 20. 21, with the annexed penalty as follows, 'And if a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing: he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness; they shall be childless.' This law is of course to be understood with the exception, that if the deceased brother died childless, it was not only *lawful* for the surviving brother to marrry the widow, but he was *obliged* to do it, or incur the penalty of being publicly disgraced in the eyes of all Israel, Deut. 25. 5–10.

The consideration of the present precept becomes, as is well known, extremely important, from its connexion with the question respecting the lawfulness of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The leading principles involved in the discussion of this subject have been already adverted to in our prefatory remarks, and the general result to which we have been brought stated. The parallel marriage, it is certain, is not forbidden *in so many terms;* neither is it expressly forbidden that a man shall marry his own daughter or his grandmother. But who will deny that a man in doing this would be sinning against God, or, in other words, acting contrary to the divine will? The decision of the question evidently rests on the truth or falsity of the position, that the precept expressly naming and prohibiting

17 ° Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter, neither shalt thou take

° ch. 20. 14.

any particular degree of relation must be understood to comprise all relations within the same degree. In the present case the prohibition, v. 16, against marrying a brother's wife, is founded *solely* on the relation existing between the parties; and as the relation in the supposed case is precisely the same, with the exception only of the change of the sex, it is not easy to conceive what reason shall be assigned why the one is not equally forbidden with the other.

It is indeed affirmed, that as this law is subject to the exception mentioned Deut. 25. 5–10, 'If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife,' &c.; therefore this enactment virtually rescinds the whole precept against marrying a sister-in-law. But to this it may be replied, that an exception to a general law, or a proviso in a particular case, is never considered as a repeal of the law, but a confirmation of it in all other cases in which there is no exception nor proviso. They are only a suspension of the law in the particular cases specified, and cannot extend to other cases, much less to the whole law to which they relate. The statute in Deut. 25, is not intended to ascertain the degrees of kindred within which marriages are prohibited; this is unequivocally done in the chapter before us. The only object of the exception is expressly mentioned. A brother is directed to marry the widow of his deceased brother in a certain emergency. The brother must have died without male issue. Had the deceased left a *son*, the general law of incest would have rendered a marriage with his widow as incestuous as with any other woman near of kin. The exception was evidently *local* in its nature, and restricted to the theocracy. It was enacted for the express purpose of preserving families and inheritances unbroken until the Messiah came. Whatever, then, might be the scope or operation of the exception, it must necessarily expire with the theocracy, leaving the *moral* part of the precept in its full force. But the Levitical code has long since answered its ends, and is abolished. This particular feature of the law is therefore no longer binding; nor is a similar case at all possible under the New Testament. Consequently it does not appear that any sanction can be adduced from this law for the marriage in question. Christians would seem to be imperatively barred from marrying a sister-in-law, who has been the wife of a deceased brother, and still more a sister-in-law who is *the sister of a deceased wife*, to whom the exception in Deut. never did, and in the nature of things never could apply. The conclusion, therefore, would seem to be unavoidable, that there is nothing in the law of Deut. 25. which invalidates the moral nature and perpetual obligation of the law forbidding marriage with a deceased wife's sister—nothing which in any form or degree can be binding upon Christians under the New Testament dispensation—and nothing in the letter or spirit of that precept which has the least reference to the question before us.

Results.

A Man may not marry his
Brother's wife,
Wife's sister:
Nor a Woman her
Husband's brother,
Sister's husband.

With a Step-Daughter or a Granddaughter.

17. *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter.* Heb. ערות אשה ובתה *ervath ishah*

her son's daughter, or her daughter's daughter, to uncover her nakedness: *for* they *are* her near kinswomen: it *is* wickedness.

18 Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, [p] to vex *her*, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other, in her life-*time*.

[p] 1 Sam. 1. 6, 8.

u-bittah. The phraseology here is peculiar, and would seem at first blush to forbid a particular form of polygamy, or perhaps some single incestuous act. Indeed we are not prepared to say that this may not be intended. It may possibly have been designed to inspire a horror of conjoint cohabitation with mother and daughter at the same time. But an equally just sense undoubtedly is, that one was not at liberty, upon the death of his wife, to marry *her* daughter (not his own), and as a mother and daughter are 'remainder of flesh' to each other, the marrying of the daughter, even after the death of the mother, was a species of marrying both at once, and therefore the copulative 'and' is employed—'a woman *and* her daughter.' Upon this class of connexions, Maimonides writes thus;—'When a man marrieth a woman, there are six women of her kin unlawful to him forever, whether his wife live with him or be divorced; whether she be alive or dead: and they are these—her mother, and her mother's mother, and her father's mother, and her daughter, and her daughter's daughter, and her son's daughter. And if he lie with any of these while his wife liveth, both of them are to be burned.'—*Ainsworth*. The punishment of burning in such a case is expressly enacted, ch. 20. 14, where it will be observed that the original word here rendered 'woman,' is there rendered 'wife.' 'And if a man take a wife and her mother, it is wickedness: they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they: that there be no wickedness among you.'——¶ *It is wickedness*. Heb. זמה הוא *zimmâh hi*. The original word is highly emphatic, denoting properly *nefarious wickedness*. It is 'deed defined in the Lexicons to signify *thought* or *purpose*, but the import is that of thought or counsel of an atrocious character involving some signal enormity. The Gr. has for it ασεβημα, *an impiety*, an act of gross ungodliness, from which God would have his people shrink back with horror.

Results.

A Man may not marry his
Step-daughter,
Wife's grand-daughter:
Nor a Woman her
Step-son,
Husband's grand-son.

With a Wife's Sister.

18. *Neither shall thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her*, &c. A passage of great difficulty, and yet of great importance in its bearing on the question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which we have made so prominent in our previous annotations. It is well known that the advocates of such marriages contend that this verse, by necessary implication (which in this case it seems they readily admit, though rejecting it in every other), contains an unequivocal intimation of their lawfulness, as they construe the precept thus: 'Thou shall not take another wife, who is the sister of thy first wife, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness beside the other, in her life time; although thou mayest take such a sister for a wife after the death of thy first wife.' As this construction completely overthrows the force of all the reasonings adduced on the other side, it demands a very rigid examination; and upon this we enter by adverting to the form of expression in the original. A hint of this is given to the English reader by the marginal rendering—'one wife to another,' for which many contend as

he only true version. The Heb. has אשה אל אחתה לא תקח *ishah el a'hothâh lo tikka'h, a wife, or woman, to her sister thou shalt not take.* As to the meaning of the separate terms there is no doubt. It is admitted on all sides that אשה *ishah* means 'woman' or wife,' אל *el, to,* and אחתה *a'hothâh, ister.* But it is not clear what the words import when taken altogether, s we find the phrase אשה אל אחתה *shah el a'hothâh* used *idiomatically* to ignify the *adding of one thing to another,* as is also the corresponding phrase איש אל אחיו *ish el a'hiv, a man to his rother.* Of these phrases the former—a man to his brother'—occurs *twenty-five* times in the Hebrew scriptures, nd the latter—'a woman to her sister' —*ten* times. Neither of the phrases re confined to *persons;* they are both requently, and in fact generally, spoken f *inanimate substances* as will appear rom the citations which we give, including all the important instances.

(1.) איש אל אחיו
A man to his brother.

Gen. 37. 19, 'And they said *one to nother,* (איש אל אחיו *a man to his rother*).'

Ex. 25. 20, 'And the faces of the herubim shall look *one to another* איש אל אחיו *a man to his brother.*)'

Ex. 37. 9, 'The cherubim stood with heir faces *one to another* (איש אל אחיו *a man to his brother*).'

Jer. 13. 14, 'And I will dash them *ne against another* (איש אל אחיו *a nan to his brother*).'

Jer. 25 26, 'And all the kings of the orth *one with another* (איש אל אחיו *man to his brother*).'

Ezek. 24. 23, 'And mourn *one towards nother* (איש אל אחיו *a man to his rother*).'

In addition to the above we find, in he masculine form, several equivalent nodes of expression slightly varying rom that now given; as איש את אחיו *sh eth a'hiv, a man his brother,* i. e. one another; איש כאחיו *ish keâ'hiv, a man as his brother,* i. e. one man as another; איש ואחיו *ish veâ'hiv, a man and his brother,* i. e. one man with another; איש מאחיו *ish meâ'hiv, a man from his brother,* i. e. one man from another; איש אחיו *ish â'hiv, a man his brother,* i. e. one man another; איש מעל אחיו *ish mëal â'hiv, a man from his brother,* i. e. one from another; איש לאחיו *ish leâ'hiv, a man to his brother,* i. e. one to another. The usage in these cases is too obvious to need remark; but we are more especially concerned with the feminine form, which we now proceed to illustrate.

(2.) אשה אל אחתה
A Woman to her Sist

Ex. 26. 3, 'The five curtains shall be coupled together *one to another* אשה אל אחתה *a woman to her sister*), and other five curtains shall be coupled *one to another* (אשה אל אחתה *a woman to her sister*).'

Ex. 26. 5, 'That the loops may take hold *one of another* (אשה אל אחתה *a woman to her sister*).'

Ex. 26. 6. 'And couple the curtains *together* (אשה אל אחתה *a woman to her sister*).'

Ex. 26. 17. 'Two tenons shall be set *one against another* (אשה אל אחתה *a woman to her sister*).'

Ezek. 1. 9, and 11. 'Their wings were joined *one to another* (אשה אל אחתה *a woman to her sister*).'

Ezek. 1. 23, 'And their wings were straight *one towards another* (אשה אל אחתה *a woman to her sister*).'

Ezek. 3. 10, 'The wings of the living creatures touched *one another* (אשה אל אחתה *a woman to her sister*).'

These are all the instances, except the present, where the phrase אשה אל אחתה *a wife to her sister* occurs, and it will be observed that in every one, except the case before us, the rendering in our translation is *one to another, together,* or some phraseology wholly equivalent. In no other in-

stance do we meet with the literal version, *a wife or woman to her sister*. So in the twenty-five instances of the masculine form, the rendering of our translators is uniform, *one to another*, whether spoken of persons or things. In no case do we find any reference to *relationship by blood*. The question therefore arises whether the literal version in this place, involving, as it does, a departure from common usage, is warranted. It is admitted that the thirty-four indisputable cases in which this mode of speech occurs in an *idiomatic* sense go very far to establish this as in all cases the genuine signification of the phrase. It would seem, at first view, that such an overwhelming majority of instances would be completely decisive of the point in dispute; and yet we cannot but concede that there is in this one case very great reason to doubt. For it will be observed that in every other instance, not only are the things which are to be added to each other *inanimate* objects of the feminine gender, but the *subject of discourse* is first mentioned, and by *that* is the import of the phrase governed. If we take the expression here according to its import in every other case in which it occurs, we shall be obliged to render the verse, 'Thou shalt not take one to another to vex,' &c. One what? —it might properly be asked. If it be said, one woman, this is immediately giving a new latitude to the phrase beyond what it *idiomatically* implies; and yet its force *as an idiom* is all that is relied upon in proof of its referring not to a *sister*, but to any *other woman*. The principles then of a fair exegesis would seem to compel us, if we understand *woman* or *wife* by אשה *ishah*, to understand *sister* by אחתה *a'hothah*. Again, it appears that in every other case the phrase has a *reciprocal import*; that is, a number of things are said to be so and so *one to another*. But here we perceive nothing of this. There is no trace of mutual, reciprocal action or relation. It is simply taking one object in addition to another, and leaving the whole phraseology utterly imperfect as compared with the Hebrew usage.

We cannot but think, therefore, that 'a wife to her sister' is the appropriate rendering in this place; and it is not a matter of small weight in confirmation, that all the ancient versions, as the Chal. Targ. of Onkelos, the Samaritan, the Syriac, and the Arabic, adhere to the literal construction. The Greek of the Seventy also, which elsewhere renders the Heb. phrase by *one to another*, here has γυναικα επ' αδελφῃ ου ληψῃ, *a woman to her sister thou shalt not take*. At the same time, the advocate for the *idiomatic* interpretation has a right to demand a probable reason for the change of diction observable in this verse, when compared with the preceding. Why does it not commence with the formula ערות אשה ואחתא לא תגלה *ervath eshah vea'hothah lo tegalleh, the nakedness of a wife and her sister thou shalt not uncover?* To this it is perhaps a satisfactory answer, that the writer wished to introduce the terms for 'uncovering nakedness' in a little different relation in the subsequent part of the verse, and so to connect them with other words as to form a *strong dissuasive* against the union forbidden. On reading the verse entire we should doubtless find it extremely difficult to hit upon any mode of expression so well adapted to convey the sense intended as that which actually occurs, and this is what necessitated a departure from the fixed phraseology that runs through the other precepts, because we have here not the precept only, but an argument to enforce it—an argument drawn from the effects of such a marriage upon domestic happiness. The lawgiver, in the other verses, speaks for the most part the language of *simple absolute authority*; in this he hints at a *reason* for his command. We might expect, therefore, a slight change in the form of speech.

But although we feel constrained to give up the argument drawn from the Hebrew *idiom*, and usually applied in this connexion to convert the passage before us into a direct prohibition of polygamy, and therefore as having nothing to do with the question of the disputed marriage; and though we cannot in fairness avoid admitting that the connexion here forbidden is *marriage with a wife's sister;* yet we do not for that reason feel laid under any necessity of admitting the inference which is so commonly drawn from the final clause of the verse. 'Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other *in her life-time*.' From this, it is said, the implication is palpable, that the obligation of the law is limited by the life time of the first wife, and that upon her decease there is no bar to the husband's marrying her sister. This we must regard as a gross *non sequitur*. The expression 'in her life time' is too slight to be allowed to vacate the force of all the considerations which we have before adduced in proof of the *implied prohibitions* contained in the preceding verses. If the inference which we have shown to be deducible from v. 16 be intrinsically sound, it cannot be set aside by any expression in the verse before us; for there is nothing here more *certain* than we have found above. At the very utmost it is merely setting one inference against another. The genuine import of the phrase 'in her life time' in this connexion undoubtedly is, *as long as she lives*, without the least implication of any thing that is to follow, or that may follow. You are not to take a step which will be sure to embitter the lot of the first wife during the whole period of her life. The consequence of your rashness, or indiscretion, or malevolence, will be, that she will know peace no more as long as she lives.

But what, it may be asked, is the real scope of the precept? Is it a direct and categorical prohibition of polygamy? To this we are for ourselves constrained to answer, No. Although polygamy was essentially contrary to the genius of the marriage institution, and never truly *sanctioned* by the Most High, yet it was evidently *tolerated*, and the divine legislation not only recognized its existence, but provided against its abuses. If the text in question contains a positive prohibition of that sin, the good men of Israel must have known it. Whatever ambiguity it may have to us, it could have none to them; and can it be supposed that David, for instance, knew there was such a law, and yet spent his life in open violation of it? 'Again,' says the author of an able series of articles on this subject in the N. E. Puritan, 'we show that polygamy is not prohibited in this text by a plain *reductio ad absurdum*. For in the first place, if that be the sin forbidden, it is a sin whose penalty is death. For after completing the series, the lawgiver says, 'Whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them, *shall be cut off from among the people*.' That these terms import punishment by death is indisputable. Now suppose the crime thus threatened, to have been that of marrying two wives. Then we have the absurdity of an express law against bigamy, declaring that bigamists shall be punished with death; and then afterwards a law requiring all bigamists to make a fair disposal of their estates among the children of their two wives. For in Deut. 21. 15, we read; 'If a man have two wives, one beloved and the other hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the firstborn be hers that was hated, then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved firstborn before the son of the hated.' Now this is a strange law to come in after a law that had denounced death on any one that should have two wives. For

if the first law were executed, the second would be superfluous. The second supposes men to be living quietly and rearing families, and making wills at the close of a peaceful life, when the previous law supposes them to have died malefactors. It involves the absurdity of one law made on the supposition that the other would be trampled on.'

If, then, polygamy is not forbidden in this passage, what is? We answer, that it was designed to discountenance the practice which is implied in the plain and literal terms of the text—the taking simultaneously of two sisters to wife. This was a practice which, as a general fact, would be attended with unhappy consequences to the domestic relations of all the parties concerned. Reference is undoubtedly to be had all along to the prevalent sentiments and usages of the Oriental nations. It is well known that among them the custom of having more than one wife in a single household is very apt to engender rivalries, jealousies, and feuds between those who share the divided marital favors and affections of their common lord. In such a state of things, there was something peculiarly repulsive in the spectacle of two *natural sisters*, who ought to be tenderly bound to each other by the ties of blood, and studious of each other's happiness, thrown as a matter of course into a species of hostile attitude one towards the other, and thus proving each to each a source of continual irritation and vexation. Thus we see it was in the family of Jacob; and it is highly probable that as in one of the foregoing precepts there was a latent allusion to the case of Abraham, so here was a designed, though implicit, reference to that of Jacob. The Most High would so frame the precept as to counteract the plea of patriarchal example for its violation.

But all inferences, drawn from the phrase 'in her life time,' as if that legitimated, after the death of the one sister, a marriage which was forbidden before, are wholly gratuitous. Such an implication cannot be shown to have entered at all into the drift of the precept. Its genuine purport was to intimate that the vexation created by such a step to the first wife would last as long as she lived—that there would be 'no discharge in that (domestic) war.' And with a very malicious or evil-minded man, this fact might of itself be in some cases a prompting motive to such a union. But upon all such considerate cruelty as this, the divine precept would frown in advance.

On the whole, therefore, we are unable to perceive that the precept we are now considering has any, even the most remote, relation to the subject of incestuous marriages treated of in the preceding context. The whole law concerning incest closes with the 17th verse. The prohibition in the 18th respects altogether another subject, and is as distinct from incest as any of the other crimes mentioned and forbidden in the remaining parts of the chapter. It might indeed appear, from the use of the word 'neither' at the commencement of the verse, that it was intimately connected with the foregoing. But this rendering is not borne out by the original. It is the simple particle ו *ve, and*, which we find in the Hebrew text, and is precisely the same word which in the three subsequent verses is translated respectively, 'also, 'moreover,' and 'and;' and the usual paragraph distinction might very properly have been introduced here.

But we proceed with the exposition. ——¶ *To vex* her. Heb. לְצָרֳרָ *litzror, to vex*; i. e. to produce vexation in the family, to the first wife mainly, no doubt, but not to her alone, as the appopriate word for 'her' is wanting in the original. Still it is properly enough inserted in our translation. The original is happily expressive of the mutual broils and bickerings which are so prone to arise under a system of polygamy, and

of which we have an example in the case of Hannah and Penninah, in the family of Elkanah. 1 Sam. 1. 6, 7, 'And her *adversary* (צרתה *tzârûthâh, her vexer*) also provoked her sore, for to make her fret, because the Lord had shut up her womb. And as she did so year by year, when she went up to the house of the Lord, so she provoked her; therefore she wept and did not eat.' If this was a state of things to be deprecated between women who were not related before marriage, how much more between *sisters!*——¶ *To uncover her nakedness besides the other.* Heb. לגלות ערותה עליה *legalloth ervathâh âlĕhâ, to uncover her nakedness upon her.* The phraseology is somewhat ambiguous, as it does not at once appear to which of the sisters the suffix 'her' infers. Is it the one who is vexed whose nakedness is uncovered, or the other? It is to be observed that in the original there is no word strictly answering to 'the other.' That which our version renders 'besides the other,' is in the Heb. עליה *upon or by her*, and the feminine suffix ה *hâ, her*, undoubtedly refers to the same person as the ה *hâ, her*, in ערותה *ervathâh, nakedness.* The true reading then is—'to uncover her (the first wife's) nakedness upon her (the first wife) in her life-time.' This appears to be the necessary grammatical construction, but how does this vex the first wife, to uncover her own nakedness upon or by herself? The solution of the difficulty we believe is to be found in the fact clearly intimated in v. 7, that the nakedness of the husband is the nakedness of the wife, and that what is here termed the 'uncovering of her nakedness' is really the uncovering of the nakedness of the husband, and exposing it to the second wife, which is of course done *by, upon, beside* the first, and therefore to her grievance and vexation.——¶ *In her life*-time. Heb. בחייה *behayĕhâ, in her life.* That is, as intimated above, during the period of her life, as long as she lives. The next verse affords a phraseology strikingly equivalent. 'Thou shalt not approach unto a woman—*as long as she is set apart*,' &c. This is expressed in the Hebrew by the single word בנדת *beniddath, in her separation*, i. e. during the continuance of her state of separation. We give in this connexion the note of Bishop Patrick on this phrase. 'From hence some infer that a man was permitted to marry the sister of his former wife, when she was dead. So the Talmudists; but the Karaites thought it absolutely unlawful, as Mr. Selden observes, (De Uxore Hebr. Lib. 1, cap. 4). For it is directly against the scope of all these laws, which prohibit men to marry at all with such persons as are here mentioned, either in their wives' lifetime or after. And there being a prohibition v. 16, to marry a brother's wife, it is unreasonable to think Moses gave them leave to marry their wives' sister. These words, therefore, 'in her lifetime,' are to be referred, not to the first words, 'neither shalt thou take,' but to the next, 'to vex her,' as long as she lives. In this the ancient Christians were so strict that if a man, after his wife died, married her sister, he was, by the tenth canon of the Council of Eliberis, to be kept from the communion for five years.'

We have thus given what, on the whole, we are constrained to regard as the genuine sense of this important part of the Penteteuch, both in its general scope and in its minuter details. We may possibly have erred by adopting false principles of interpretation, or by a wrong application of those which are right. But as we have candidly stated the grounds and evidence of every position assumed, the reader will be able to judge for himself how far the premises sustain the conclusion, and how far a sound exegesis sustains the premises. To our minds the evidence decidedly preponderates in favor of the opinion that the laws contained in the present

19 [q] Also thou shalt not approach unto a woman to uncover her nakedness, as long as she is put apart for her uncleanness.

20 Moreover, [r] thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbour's wife, to defile thyself with her.

21 And thou shalt not let any of thy seed [s] pass through *the fire* to [t] Molech, neither shalt thou [u] pro-

[q] ch. 20. 18. Ezek. 18. 6, and 22. 10. [r] ch. 20. 10. Exod. 20. 14. Deut. 5. 18, and 22. 22. Prov. 6. 29, 32. Mal. 3. 5. Matt. 5. 27. Rom. 2. 22. 1 Cor. 6. 9. Heb. 13. 4.

[s] ch. 20. 2. 2 Kings 16. 3, and 21. 6, and 23. 10. Jer. 19. 5. Ezek. 20. 31, and 23. 37, 39. [t] 1 Kings 11. 7, 33. Acts 7. 43. [u] ch. 19. 12, and 20. 3, and 21. 6, and 22. 2, 32. Ezek. 36. 20, &c. Mal. 1. 12.

chapter (v. 6–17), have respect not merely to lewdness in general, but to incest—that they are in their nature moral and not ceremonial, and therefore universally and perpetually binding—that the implied prohibitions are equally authoritative with the express—and consequently the marriage with a deceased wife's sister is clearly contrary to the revealed word of God. At the same time, we entertain unfeigned respect for the logical and philological reasonings of those who, under the promptings of an equally sincere desire to ascertain the truth, have been brought to a different conclusion. Many of their arguments are entitled to very great weight, and we cannot fully assure ourselves that they have been fairly and successfully met in the foregoing series of remarks. But wherever the truth may lie, we still indulge a strong confidence that it will eventually be reached; and the present awakened state of the Christian mind in this land gives a happy presage that this result will ere long be realized.

Other forms of Sexual Commerce, and still grosser Crimes, forbidden.

19. *Also thou shalt not approach unto a woman*, &c. Heb. אל אשה *el isha, to a woman, or wife.* Consequently not to one's own wife. The penalty annexed to this precept is stated ch. 20. 18. The transgression of it is reckoned among the crying sins of Israel, Ezek. 22. 10.

20. *Moreover, thou shalt not lie carnally*, &c. Heb. לא תתן שכבתך לזרע *lo tittën shekobteka lezâra, thou shalt not give thy cohabitation* (or *concumbency*) *to seed*; i. e. to the effusion of seed; a form of expression sufficiently well represented by our version. Leclerc suggests that it may be intended to distinguish a sinful cohabitation from that accidental but innocent lying together which might happen from some extraordinary accident in a flight or journey.

21. *Thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech.* The name of this idol, which was especially worshipped by the Ammonites, is derived from מלך *mâlak, to reign*, the root of מלך *melek, king*, and is supposed to have represented the sun, the great fountain of fire and of light. In the inhuman worship of this idol, little children were either actually burnt alive in the way of consecration to him, or were made to pass between two rows of burning fires, from which they barely escaped with life, and probably not always with that. The words 'the fire' do not here occur in the original, but they are supplied in Deut. 18. 10, and 2 Kings 11. 3, which are elsewhere explained as apparently equivalent to 'burn in the fire,' 2 Chron. 28. 3. Leclerc supposes very ingeniously that the term 'pass through,' omitting 'the fire,' was invented by the priests of Molech or Moloch, that the horrid sacrifice might be expressed by the mildest possible phrase. This form of idolatry is mentioned and forbidden in the present connexion, in the midst of laws relative to incest and lewdness, from its being esteemed a kind of *spiritual adultery*

——¶ *Neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God.* Heb. תחלל *te'hallël*

fane the name of thy God: I *am* the LORD.

22 [x] Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it *is* abomination.

23 [y] Neither shalt thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto: it *is* [z] confusion.

24 [a] Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: [b] for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you:

25 And [c] the land is defiled:

[x] ch. 20. 13 Rom. 1. 27. 1 Cor. 6. 9. 1 Tim. 1. 10. [y] ch. 20. 15, 16. Exod. 22. 19. [z] ch. 20. 12. [a] ver. 30. Matt. 15. 18, 19, 20. Mark 7. 21, 22, 23. 1 Cor. 3. 17. [b] ch. 20. 23. Deut. 18. 12. [c] Numb. 35. 34. Jer. 2, 7, and 16. 18. Ezek. 36. 17.

pollute; the contrary of *hallowing* or *sanctifying*. The holy name of God is polluted or profaned not only by irreverent and blasphemous *speech*, but by such *conduct* as tends to give that honor and allegiance, which is due to him alone, to another.

22. *Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind.* Heb. את זכר *eth zâkâr, with a male.* The characteristic sin of Sodom, and thence deriving the name by which it is known in the criminal codes of modern times. Comp. Deut. 23. 17. It is enumerated by the apostle, Rom. 1. 27, among the prevalent abominations of heathenism; and the best authorities assure us that under the name of *pederasty*, or *boy-love*, it was practised not only by several of the Roman emperors, but by some of the Greek philosophers. The penalty annexed to this law is stated as follows, ch. 20. 13: 'If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.' The penalties enacted by modern legislators against this and the crime of bestiality, evince it as the general sense of enlightened and Christian nations, that those who thus shockingly degrade human nature are not worthy to live among men.

General Dissuasives.

24. *For in these all the nations are defiled which I cast out before you.* Heb. אשר אני משלח *asher ani meshalla'h, which I am casting out.* The Canaanites being divided into several clans or tribes, are spoken of in the plural, as 'nations;' and they, it appears, were so completely overrun with these foul abominations, that a righteous God could bear with them no longer; and as they were now lying under his curse, so they were shortly, by his sword, wielded by the hands of the chosen people, to be completely destroyed. By the coming doom of the Canaanites, therefore, he would have them to take warning, and not to imagine that any peculiar favoritism would save them from a similar destruction, provided they were guilty of similar crimes. On the other hand, they might reasonably anticipate a more aggravated and fearful judgment, according to the declared principle of the divine administration, 'Because you only have I known of all the nations of the earth, therefore will I punish your iniquities.'

25. *Therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it,* &c. Heb. ואפקד *vâephkod*, properly *I have visited;* i. e. have punished; and in the next clause *hath vomited*, instead of *vomiteth;* the præterite being used for greater emphasis. The certainty of the result was such, that it is spoken of as if already accomplished.——¶ *The land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.* A bold rhetorical figure, intimating that the sins of the inhabitants were so unutterably vile and loathsome, that the very land itself nauseated and abhorred them, and threw them out, as the stomach does the food that offends it.

30. *Therefore shall ye keep mine*

therefore I do [d] visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself [e] vomiteth out her inhabitants.

26 [f] Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit *any* of these abominations; *neither* any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you:

27 (For all these abominations have the men of the land done, which *were* before you, and the land is defiled;)

28 That [g] the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that *were* before you.

29 For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit *them* shall be cut off from among their people.

30 Therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance, [h] that *ye* commit not *any one* of these abominable customs, which were committed before you, and that ye [i] defile not yourselves therein: [k] I *am* the LORD your God.

[d] Ps. 89. 32. Isai. 26. 21. Jer. 5. 9, 29, and 9. 9, and 14. 10, and 23. 2. Hos. 2. 13, and 8. 13, and 9. 9. [e] ver. 28. [f] ver. 5, 30. ch. 20. 22, 23. [g] ch. 20. 22. Jer. 9. 19. Ezek. 36. 13, 17.

CHAPTER XIX.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, [a] Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God *am* holy.

3 ¶ [b] Ye shall fear every man his mother and his father, and [c] keep my sabbaths: I *am* the LORD your God.

[h] ver. 3, 26. ch. 20. 23. Deut. 18. 9. [i] ver. 24. [k] ver. 2, 4. [a] ch. 11. 44, and 20. 7, 26. 1 Pet. 1. 16. [b] Exod. 20. 12. [c] Exod. 20. 8, and 31. 13.

---

ordinance, &c. Heb. שמרתם את משמרתי *shemartem eth mishmarti, ye shall keep my keepings;* i. e. my charge; that which I have delivered you to keep; implying that the only way to be preserved from all false worship, is seriously to consider and devoutly to observe the ordinances of the true religion.

CHAPTER XIX.

The present chapter is devoted, for the most part, to the repetition of certain laws which had been before given, but which from their intrinsic importance, the divine wisdom saw fit to insist upon with special emphasis. It will be seen that they have in the main more reference to *moral* than to *positive* duties, and brief as it is, it may be confidently affirmed that no merely human code was ever devised so well calculated in its observance to promote the well-being of the race. Except in one single case we find no special penalty annexed to the transgression of these precepts, but they are delivered as self-enforced on the simple supreme authority of Him who enacts them; 'I am the Lord your God'—a declaration which in this connexion is, as it were, a royal signature to a solemn edict.

2. *Say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy.* The same sanction had been given before, ch. 11. 44, in connexion with the precepts respecting the distinction of meats, by which they were to be severed and set apart from all other nations; and so here when they are again commanded to be distinguished from all other people by a peculiar system of moral laws and usages, the same injunction is repeated. Indeed one grand leading sense involved in the term 'holy' is *separated, sequestered, set apart* from that which is common and secular.

Enjoining Reverence of Parents.

3. *Ye shall fear every man his mother and his father.* The 'fear' here required, is virtually the same with the honor commanded by the fifth commandment. It includes inward rever-

4 ¶ [d] Turn ye not unto idols, [e] nor make to yourselves molten gods: I *am* the LORD your God.

[d] Exod. 20. 4. ch. 26. 1. 1 Cor. 10. 14. 1 John 5. 21. [e] Exod. 34. 17. Deut. 27. 15.

5 ¶ And [f] if ye offer a sacrifice of peace-offerings unto the LORD, ye shall offer it at your own will.

6 It shall be eaten the same day

[f] ch. 7. 16.

ence and esteem, outward expression of respect, obedience to the lawful commands of parents, care and endeavor to please and render them comfortable, and to avoid any thing that may offend and grieve them, or incur their displeasure. It will be noticed also that in this connexion the 'mother' is mentioned before the 'father,' which is contrary to prevailing usage. The two precepts, 'Honor thy father and thy mother,' and 'Fear thy mother and thy father,' when taken together plainly evince that both father and mother are to be regarded as entitled to *equal* tokens of honor, respect, and reverence. If the 'father' had been uniformly placed first, it might have imperceptibly begotten the impression that the mother's claims to veneration were but of a *secondary* nature.——¶ *Keep my sabbaths*, i. e. not only the seventh day, but all other appointed days, which were also called *sabbaths*. Chal. 'Keep my sabbath-days.' This precept is joined with that requiring filial reverence, inasmuch as it is supposed that if God provides by law for the preserving of the honor of parents, parents will use their authority for keeping up in the minds and conduct of their children a due regard for the divine institutions, particularly the one in question. The contempt of parents, and the profanation of the sabbath usually go together, and begin the ruin of the young. The prospects of those children are the brightest who make conscience of honoring their parents and keeping holy the sabbath day.

Idolatry forbidden.

4. *Turn ye not unto idols.* Heb. אל האלילם *el hâelilim, to non-entities.* Gr. *ουκ επακολουθησετε ειδωλοις, follow not idols.* The import of the original is *things of nought, nothings, vanities*, in allusion to which the apostle says, 1 Cor. 8. 4, 'We know that an idol is *nothing* in the world.' The word occurs also in Job 13. 4, 'Ye are forgers of lies, ye are all *physicians of no value* (רפאי אלל *rophïe elil, physicians of nought*),' which gives still farther light upon the meaning of the term. To such idols they were not to 'turn' in a way of heed, affection, consultation, or worship. They were not to regard them but with the utmost abhorrence, and as the chief of all abominations. They could not turn *to* them, without turning *away* from God, and this would be downright *apostacy*.——¶ *Nor make to yourselves molten gods.* Heb. אלהי מסכה *elohë massëkah, gods of molting*, such, for instance, as was the molten calf fabricated by Aaron at the instigation of the people, Ex. 32. 4. The spirit of the precept prohibits, of course, every species of image, whether molten or graven, designed as a representative of any object of worship. Habak. 2. 18, 'What profiteth the graven image that the maker thereof hath graven it; the molten image, and (even) a teacher of lies, that the maker of his work trusteth therein, to make dumb idols?'

Concerning Peace-offerings.

5–8. *If ye offer a sacrifice of peace-offerings*, &c. As they were to avoid all idolatry, so they were to be careful to perform the service due to God in the prescribed manner. Peace-offerings are here mentioned as perhaps the most common, but the spirit of the precept doubtless applies to all others. The various rites and ceremonies connected with this offering have been already

ye offer it, and on the morrow: and if aught remain until the third day, it shall be burnt in the fire.

7 And if it be eaten at all on the third day, it *is* abominable; it shall not be accepted.

8 Therefore *every one* that eateth it shall bear his iniquity, because he hath profaned the hallowed thing of the LORD; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people.

9 ¶ And [g] when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest.

10 And thou shalt not glean thy

[g] ch. 23. 22. Deut. 24. 19, 20, 21. Ruth 2. 15. 16.

---

detailed, ch. 3. 7, 16.——¶ *Ye shall offer it at your own will.* Or rather, according to the Heb. לרצנכם *lirtzonekem*, 'to your favorable acceptation,' i. e. in such a manner as may secure the divine favor and acceptance, which it would not do if it were offered otherwise than in exact accordance with the prescribed mode. See Note on Lev. 1. 3.

Gleanings to be left for the Poor.

9. *When ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap,* &c. Heb. לא תכלה פאת שדך *lo tekalleh peath sâdeka, thou shalt not finish, consummate, make a full end of, the corner of thy field;* thou shalt not make a clean riddance of it. On this precept the Jewish canons remark, 'He that reapeth his field must not reap all the field wholly; but must leave a little standing corn for the poor in the end of the field, whether he cut it or pluck it up: and that which is left is called the corner (פאה *peah*). And as he must leave of the field, so of the trees, when he gathereth their fruit, he must leave a little for the poor.' The Jewish writers say that a *sixtieth* part was left. However this may be, the precept is full of interest, as exhibiting a very amiable feature of the Levitical law, which in many of its provisions breathed a spirit of humane and benevolent consideration, for which we look in vain to any other code, either of ancient or modern times. 'The right of the poor in Israel to glean after the reapers, was thus secured by a positive law. It is the opinion of some writers, that although the poor were allowed the liberty of gleaning, the Israelitish proprietors were not obliged to admit them immediately into the field, as soon as the reapers had cut down the corn, and bound it up in sheaves, but when it was carried off; they might choose also among the poor, whom they thought most deserving or most necessitous. These opinions receive some countenance from the request which Ruth presented to the servant of Boaz, to permit her to glean 'among the sheaves;' and from the charge of Boaz to his young men, 'let her glean even among the sheaves;' a mode of speaking which seems to insinuate, that though they could not legally hinder Ruth from gleaning in the field, they had a right, if they chose to exercise it, to prohibit her from gleaning among the sheaves, or immediately after the reapers.'—*Paxton.*——¶ *Neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of the harvest.* That is, if a few ears of corn, as they were cutting or binding it up, fell out of the sheaves or from under the sickle, they were not to gather them up from the ground, but to leave them for the poor. And so also in respect to the scattered grape-clusters of the vintage. The rule thus given was intended for the benefit not only of the *poor*, but also of the *stranger;* for as strangers and foreigners could not hold their possessions on the same advantageous terms as native Israelites, they were very liable to be oppressed by poverty. It is easy to perceive that the natural tendency of this law was to inculcate a kindly, liberal, generous spirit, the

vineyard, neither shalt thou gather *every* grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger: I *am* the LORD your God.

11 ¶ [h] Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, [i] neither lie one to another.

12 ¶ And ye shall not [k] swear by my name falsely, [l] neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I *am* the LORD.

13 ¶ [m] Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbour, neither rob *him:* [n] the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning.

14 ¶ Thou shalt not curse the

[h] Exod. 20. 15, and 22. 1, 7, 10. Deut. 5. 19. [i] ch. 6. 2. Eph. 4. 25. Col. 3. 9. [k] Exod. 20. 7. ch. 6. 3. Deut. 5. 11. Matt. 5. 33. Jam. 5. 12.

[l] ch. 18. 21. [m] Mark 10. 19. 1 Thess. 4. 6. [n] Deut. 24. 14, 15. Mal. 3. 5.

direct reverse of a disposition covetous and griping, and which would prompt a man vigorously to insist on his right in matters small and trivial. It is a lesson which the selfish nature of man needs to have powerfully enforced upon him, that that is not necessarily lost or wasted, which goes to relieve the wants or diminish the woes of our common humanity.

Against Stealing, Lying, False Swearing, and Defrauding.

11-13. *Ye shall not steal*, &c. A number of moral precepts, important to the upholding of truth and justice in society, are here inserted. The drift of them is to inculcate a rigid adherence to truth in our communications, and to honesty in our dealings with our fellow men. Stealing had been before forbidden in the eighth commandment, and lying in the ninth; but they are here repeated and put together, because they generally go together. He that will steal will lie to hide it; and he that will lie shows that the first moral barrier is broken down which stands in the way of the commission of any and all crimes.——¶ *Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor nor rob him.* Heb. תעשק *taas'ok* and תגזל *tigzol.* The first of these terms signifies in the original *to oppress by fraud*, the second, *to oppress by violence.* Against both these offences John the Baptist warned the soldiers who came to him, Luke 3. 14, 'And he said unto them, *Do violence* to no man, neither *accuse any falsely;* and be content with your wages.' These sins of *fraudulent oppression* and *robbery* are often charged by the prophets upon the nation of Israel. See Is. 3. 14. Jer. 22. 2.——¶ *The wages of him that is hired shall not abide*, &c. Inasmuch as the wages of the hireling, a day-laborer, were the support of himself and family, and they would necessarily be forced to expend it as fast as it could be earned. There are few sins marked in the Scriptures more with the emphatic reprobation of heaven than the withholding of wages from those to whom they are due. James 5. 1, 4, 'Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. * * Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.' If the Scriptures had approved the system of 'credit' in doing business, it would scarcely have been so strenuous in the requisition for prompt payment.

Against taking advantage of the Infirmity of the Deaf or Blind.

14. *Thou shalt not curse.* Heb. לא תקלל *lo tekallël, thou shalt not vilify, defame, contemptuously disparage.* Gr. ουκ κακως ερεις, *thou shalt not speak evil of.* Not being able to *hear*, he could not, of course, vindicate his own character. In cursing one who *could* hear there was no doubt a wicked malignity; but in cursing the deaf there was, moreover, an inexpressible *mean-*

deaf, ° nor put a stumbling-block before the blind, but shalt ᵖ fear thy God: I *am* the LORD.

15 ¶ ᵠ Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty:

° Deut. 27. 18. Rom. 14. 13. ᵖ ver. 32. ch. 25. 17. Gen. 42. 18. Eccles. 5. 7. 1 Pet. 2. 17. ᵠ Exod. 23. 2, 3. Deut. 1. 17, and 16. 19, and 27. 19. Ps. 82. 2. Prov. 24. 23. James 2. 9.

but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbour.

16 ¶ ʳ Thou shalt not go up and down *as* a tale-bearer among thy people; neither shalt thou ˢ stand against the blood of thy neighbour; I *am* the LORD.

ʳ Exod. 23. 1. Ps. 15. 3, and 50. 20. Prov. 11. 13, and 20. 19. Ezek. 22. 9. ˢ Exod. 23. 1, 7. 1 Kings 21. 13. Matt. 26. 60, 61, and 27. 4.

ness. The case of the *absent*, who are out of hearing of the curse, is obviously the same as that of the *deaf*, and we see no reason why the prohibition does not include both.——¶ *Nor put a stumbling block before the blind.* Gr. *ου προσθησεις σκανδαλον, thou shalt not put a scandal* (a cause of stumbling or offence). This precept the gospel makes universal. Rom. 14. 13, 'Let no man put a stumbling-block (Gr. *σκανδαλον, a scandal*), in his brother's way.' Again, Matt. 18. 7, 'Woe unto the world because of *offences* (Gr. *σκανδαλα, scandals, or stumbling-blocks*).' The spirit of these precepts is to forbid not only the ridiculing the bodily infirmities, but the taking advantage, in any case, of the ignorance, simplicity, or inexperience of others, particularly the giving bad counsel to those that are simple and easily imposed upon, by which they may be led to do something to their own injury. On the contrary, we are always to do to our neighbor as we would, upon a change of circumstances, that he should do to us.——¶ *Shalt fear thy God.* Though thou mayest not fear the deaf and the blind, who cannot call thee to an account, yet remember that God both sees and hears, and he will avenge thy wickedness.

Against respect of Persons in Judgment.

15. *Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor.* Heb. לֹא תִשָּׂא פְנֵי *lo tissë pânim, thou shalt not lift up or accept the face.* That is, shalt not show favor from private regards, and thus pervert the cause of justice. See the phrase explained Gen. 19. 21. Though the poverty of the poor might plead strongly in their favor, yet this was not to influence the decisions of the judge.

Against Tale-bearing.

16. *Thou shalt not go up and down as a tale-bearer among thy people.* Heb. לֹא תֵלֵךְ רָכִיל *lo telek râkil.* The original רָכִיל *rakil* properly signifies *a trader, a pedlar*, and is here applied to one who travels up and down dealing in slanders and detractions, as a merchant does in wares, possessing himself of the secrets of individuals and of families, and then blazing them abroad, usually with a false coloring as to motives, and a distortion of facts. In the Septuagint the Heb. is rendered, Prov. 11. 13, and 20. 19, by a word signifying 'double-tongued;' and in the New Testament the term seems to be *διαβολος diabolos, false accuser, slanderer, calumniator.* The Chal. renders the present passage 'Thou shalt not divulge accusations, or detractions, among the people.' In this sense the word is employed Dan. 6. 24, in reference to 'the men which had *accused* (*διαβολαντας slandered*) Daniel,' and analogous to this the common name applied to the Devil in Greek is *διαβολος diabolos*, from his character of calumniator and 'accuser of the brethren,' denominated in the Syriac, Matt. 4. 1, 5, 8, &c., a 'divulger of accusations.'——¶ *Neither shalt thou stand against the blood*, &c. That is, thou shalt neither be a false witness to the

17 ¶ [t] Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: [u] thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him.

[t] 1 John 2. 9, 11, and 3. 15. [u] Matt. 18. 15. Luke 17. 3. Gal. 6. 1. Ephes. 5. 11. 1 Tim. 5. 20. 2 Tim. 4. 2. Tit. 1. 13, and 2. 15. See Rom. 1. 32. 1 Cor. 5. 2. 1 Tim. 5. 22. 2 John 11.

endangering of a man's life, nor shalt thou stand by and see thy neighbor injured, crushed, ruined, and perhaps his life taken, without an effort to save him. This precept is joined with the preceding, because tale-bearing, by sowing discord and breeding broils in society often led to the shedding of blood. Thus Ezek. 22. 9, 'In thee are men that *carry tales to shed blood*.' The case of Doeg, 1 Sam. 22. 9, 18, is one singularly in point in the present instance, 'Then answered Doeg the Edomite, which was set over the servants of Saul, and said, I saw the son of Jesse coming to Nob, to Abimelech the son of Ahitub, &c. And the king said to Doeg, Turn thou and fall upon the priests. And Doeg the Edomite turned, and fell upon the priests, and slew in that day fourscore and five persons that did wear a linen ephod.'

Against Hatred and Uncharitableness.

17. *Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart.* That is, thou shalt not conceal thy hatred against him for any wrong that he has done thee; but shall mildly yet faithfully rebuke him, endeavoring to convince him of the wrong, and to bring him both to acknowledge his sin before God, and to make the adequate reparation. The Jews explain the precept thus: 'When any man sinneth against another, he must not inwardly hate him and keep silence; as it is said of the wicked, And Absalom spake unto his brother Amnon neither good nor bad, for Absalom hated Amnon, 2 Sam. 13. 22; but he is commanded to make it known unto him, and to say, Why hast thou done thus unto me?' This is confirmed by the Gospel rule, Luke 17. 3, 'If thy brother sin against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him.' It is possible, however, that the word 'hate,' may here be intended to be used rather in the sense of *virtual* or *constructive* hatred, as when it is said that the parent who withholds the rod *hates* the child; by which it is evidently implied, that one who fails to evince the *proper tokens of love*, is considered as indulging *the sentiments of hate*. God in his word so regards and speaks of it. Thus, in the present instance, the man who saw his brother, i. e. his neighbor, yielding to or living in sin, and forbore faithfully to rebuke him on account of it, was to be considered as acting the part of an enemy instead of a friend; and the conduct of an enemy is naturally supposed to be prompted by hatred instead of love.——¶ *Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor.* Heb. הוכח תוכיח *'hokĕa'h tokia'h, rebuking thou shalt rebuke;* i. e. thou shalt by all means rebuke, or, thou shalt freely, plainly, soundly rebuke. The true force of the original is *to convince*, or rather *to convict, of wrong by reasoning and argument.* Gr. ελεγξεις τον πλησιον σου, *thou shalt convincingly or demonstratively reprove thy neighbor.*——¶ *And not suffer sin upon him.* Heb. לא תשא עליו חטא *lo tissâ âlauv hĕt*, which may perhaps be correctly rendered, 'Thou shalt not bear sin (or punishment) for him;' i. e. thou shalt not, on his account, for his sake, by reason of neglecting to do your duty to him, contract guilt to your own soul. This is the usual and appropriate meaning of the phrase, as appears from Lev. 22. 9, 'They shall therefore keep mine ordinance, *lest they bear sin for it*.' Num. 18. 32, 'And ye shall *bear no sin* by reason of it;' where the original is the same as in the present case. And in this sense both the Greek and the Chaldaic understand it. The import is, that

18 ¶ [x] Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, [y] but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I *am* the LORD.

x 2 Sam. 13. 22. Prov. 20. 22. Rom. 12. 17, 19. Gal. 5. 20. Eph. 4. 31. 1 Pet. 2. 1. Jam. 5. 9. y Matt. 5. 43, and 22. 39. Rom. 13. 9. Gal. 5. 14. Jam. 2. 8.

19 ¶ Ye shall keep my statutes. Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind: [z] thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed: [a] neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woollen come upon thee.

z Deut. 22. 9, 10. a Deut. 22. 11.

a man who failed to reprove sin in another rendered himself obnoxious to the same punishment as the original offender. The phrase, however, may bear the sense given it in our version, which is equivalent to saying, 'Thou shalt not suffer him to go on in sin by neglecting to inform of it; shalt not leave him under the guilt of sin unreproved.' The saying of one of the Jewish rabbins was long current as a proverb among the nation, 'That Jerusalem had not been destroyed, but because one neighbor did not reprove another.'

Against Revenge.

18. *Thou shalt not avenge*, &c. That is, thou shalt not take into thine own hands the business of redressing thy wrongs, nor shalt thou refuse to do a kindness from the remembrance of injuries past. Gr. *ουκ εκδικαται σου ἡ χειρ, let not thine hand avenge.*——¶ *Nor bear any grudge.* Heb. לֹא תִטֹּר *lo tittor, thou shalt not watch, mark, or insidiously observe*, the sins of thy people; i. e. thou shalt not harbor resentment, and covertly watch an opportunity to 'feed fat an ancient grudge.' Gr. *ου μηνιεις, thou shalt not bear inveterate anger.* Chal. 'Thou shalt not keep (harbor) enmity.' So God is said, Nah. 1. 2, 'to take vengeance on his adversaries, and to *keep* (watch) for his enemies.' But not so towards his people, Jer. 3. 12, 'For I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not *keep* (anger) for ever.' Ps. 103. 9, 'He will not always chide; nor *keep* (his anger) for ever;' in all which cases the original word is the same.——¶ *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am the Lord thy God.* We have here in the midst of the Jewish code the grand moral law of the gospel, and that which our Savior himself gives as comprising the sum of the second table of the Decalogue, or all the duties which we owe to our fellow-men. And this law is enforced by the solemn sanction contained in the words, 'I am the Lord your God;' q. d. I am he who searches and perfectly knows your hearts, and the dispositions which you cherish, and who will reward and punish you accordingly. Nothing shows more conclusively how false and groundless are the charges sometimes brought against the Mosaic code as not only stern, cruel, and barbarous, but as insisting solely on certain outward rites and duties without any respect to inward dispositions and motives.

Against Mixtures in Cattle, Seed, and Garments.

19. *Ye shall keep my statutes.* These words are here inserted lest the ensuing ordinance should be deemed of little moment and so be neglected.——¶ *Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind.* This might perhaps have been forbidden in order to impress the Israelites with a greater abhorrence of the crime of bestiality, or at least to afford them among the brute creation no example of those unnatural commixtures which were prohibited in the foregoing chapter, v. 22, 23. Yet it would seem that it was not forbidden them to *use* animals produced from such mixtures, as we find *mules* very frequently mentioned in the sacred history, which it is well known are gendered in

20 ¶ And whosoever lieth carnally with a woman that *is* a bond-maid betrothed to an husband, and not at all redeemed, nor freedom given her; she shall be scourged: they shall not be put to death, because she was not free.

21 And [b] he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the LORD, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, *even* a ram for a trespass-offering.

22 And the priest shall make an

[b] ch. 5. 15, and 6. 6.

---

this manner. See Note on Gen. 36. 24. As to *seeds*, it would in many cases, be very improper to sow different kinds in the same spot of ground, as many species of vegetables are disposed to mix and thus produce a very degenerate crop. Thus if oats and wheat were sown together, the latter would be injured, the former ruined. The turnip and carrot would not succeed conjointly, when either of them separately would prosper and yield a good crop; and if this be all that is intended, the precept here given is agreeable to the soundest agricultural maxims. As to *garments*, the prohibition might have been merely intended to keep them aloof from the superstitious customs of the heathen, or to intimate how careful they should be not to mingle themselves with the Gentiles, nor to weave any profane usages into God's ordinances.

Relative to the Bond-maid betrothed.

20. *Whosoever lieth carnally with a woman that is a bond-maid.* The exact rendering of the Hebrew is, 'And a man when he lieth with a woman (with) the lying of seed,' to which our version comes sufficiently near. In order fully to understand the drift of the precept, it must be borne in mind, that Gentile servants were often found among the Hebrews, and these, if proselyted, were baptized, and that either with a reservation of their servitude, or with a full and free discharge. But it appears that there were some in a kind of intermediate or half-way condition, partly free and partly servile, viz., when part only of their redemption-money had been paid, a balance yet remaining. Now as no *Israelite* might marry such a woman while perfectly a slave; so, although he might *espouse* her when partly free, and the espousals be valid, yet they could not be of full force till her enfranchisement was complete. Of a bond-woman in these circumstances the Hebrew doctors understand Moses in this passage to speak, as Maimonides says expressly, 'The bond-woman betrothed spoken of in the law, is one that is half a bond-woman and half a free-woman, and betrothed to an Hebrew servant.' Gr. *αυτη οικετις ἡ διαπεφυλαγμενη ανθρωπῳ, she shall be reserved a household-servant for a man.*——¶ *Not at all redeemed, nor freedom given her.* Rather, not fully, not entirely redeemed, but only in part; and therefore her freedom not absolutely granted to her. ——¶ *She shall be scourged.* Heb. בקרת תהרה *bikkoreth tihyeh, there shall be a scourging.* The original בקרת *bikkoreth* from the root בקר *bâkar, to search, to inquire into, to examine diligently, to take note of any person or thing*, and thence in the derivative *inquisition, animadversion, punishment*, the frequent effect of a rigid examination, of a close and prying scrutiny. Gr. *εσται επισκοπη, there shall be visitation.* If she had been perfectly free both parties would have been put to death by virtue of the law, Deut. 22. 23, 25. But not being fully free, and consequently not fully the wife of her betrothed, it was not counted adultery; and therefore punished only with scourging. From the literal rendering, 'there shall be scourging,' it would doubtless seem that both parties were to share in it alike; but the Hebrew canons and the current of rabbinical authority favor rather the rendering

atonement for him with the ram of the trespass-offering before the LORD for his sin which he hath done; and the sin which he hath done shall be forgiven him.

23 ¶ And when ye shall come into the land, and shall have planted all manner of trees for food; then ye shall count the fruit thereof as uncircumcised: three years shall it be as uncircumcised unto you: it shall not be eaten of.

24 But in the fourth year all the fruit thereof shall be holy [c] to praise the LORD *withal*.

[c] Deut. 12. 17, 18. Prov. 3. 9.

---

of the English text—'She shall be scourged.' Maimonides says, The lying with this bond-woman differeth from all other unlawful connexions; for lo, she is to be beaten, and he is bound to bring a trespass-offering.' So in the Talmud (Cheret. c. 2.) it is said, 'In all unlawful connexions, whether it be man or woman, they are alike in stripes and in sacrifice: but in the case of the bond-woman, the man is not like to the woman in stripes, nor the woman to the man in sacrifice.'

Relative to the Fruit of Trees.

23. *And when ye shall have come into the land.* That is, into the promised land, to which alone it would seem this precept had reference. That it was based upon any thing beyond natural reasons, we see no grounds for believing; though Spencer and others have suggested that as the trees which they would find growing on their entrance into the land were planted by idolaters, and probably with superstitious ceremonies, their fruit being considered by the Israelites as for a time unclean, would tend to impress their minds with an idea of the impurity and abominable nature of idolatry. But it is evident from the text, that the precept has reference to such trees as *they should themselves plant*, and that it was to be of like permanent authority with the other enactments of the Levitical code. Nor do we doubt that an adequate knowledge of vegetable physiology would disclose the utmost propriety in the direction. Indeed Michaelis says, Comment. on Laws of Moses, vol. 3. p. 367–8, 'The economical object of this law is very striking. Every gardener will teach us not to let fruit-trees bear in their earliest years, but to pluck off the blossoms; and for this reason, that they will thus thrive the better, and bear more abundantly afterwards. Now, if we may not taste the fruit the first three years, we shall be the more disposed to pinch off the blossoms; and the son will learn to do this from his father. The very expression, *to regard them as uncircumcised*, suggests the propriety of pinching them off; I do not say *cutting* them off, because it is generally the hand, and not a knife, that is employed in this operation.' Although, however, the use of the fruit was only interdicted for three years, the produce did not become available to the proprietor till the fifth year, the first-fruits, that is those of that year, being in this, as in other instances, one of the dues from which the priests derived their subsistence. Perhaps a moral intimation to the effect that men were to restrain their appetites, and not to indulge in premature gratifications, was designed at the same time to be conveyed in this precept. Thus this wondrous code taught its subjects to find 'sermons in trees,' as well as 'good in every thing.'

24. *All the fruit thereof shall be holy to praise the Lord.* Heb. קדש הלולים ליהוה *kodesh hillulim laihovah, holiness of praises to the Lord.* That is, shall be consecrated to the Lord, and eaten with demonstrations of joy and praise, as Judg. 9. 27, 'they made praise;' that is, they expressed their joyful emotions by songs of praises, and probably by dancing, as the Gr. ren-

25 And in the fifth year shall ye eat of the fruit thereof, that it may yield unto you the increase thereof; I *am* the LORD your God.

[d] ch. 17. 10, &c. Deut. 12. 23. [e] Deut.

26 ¶ [d] Ye shall not eat *any thing* with the blood: [e] neither shall ye use enchantment, nor observe times.

18. 10, 11, 14. 1 Sam. 15. 23. 2 Kings 17. 17, and 21. 6. 2 Chron. 33. 6. Mal. 3. 5.

ders it. The phrase points to somewhat of more than usual festivity.

25. *In the fifth year shall ye eat of the fruit thereof, that it may yield unto you the increase thereof.* Heb. להוסיף לכם תבואתו *lehosiph lâkem tebuâtho, to add increasingly to you its product.* The intimation clearly is, that they would be no losers by waiting to the fifth year for the fruit of their trees. The forbearance would be rewarded by the far more abundant fruitfulness of the trees themselves.

Against the eating of Blood, and various Superstitious Observances.

26. *Ye shall not eat* any thing *with the blood.* Heb. לא תאכלו על הדם *lo tokelu al haddâm, ye shall not eat upon the blood.* Gr. μη εσθετε επι ορεων *eat not upon the mountains*, i. e. after the manner of idolaters; an erroneous rendering, arising from the translators having mistaken הדם *haddâm, blood*, for הרם *hârim, mountains*, ר (*r*) for ד (*d*), as they have done in numerous other instances. The sense is intrinsically good and warranted by Ezek. 18. 6, but is not the meaning here intended; although it is not perfectly obvious what the true meaning really is. The Rabbinical commentators for the most part, understand it, especially from its connexion with what follows, as a prohibition of certain idolatrous rites practised in the religion of the heathen, in which they entered into communion with demons by gathering the blood of their sacrifices into a vessel, or a little hole dug in the earth, and then sitting round it, feeding upon the flesh of the victims. But a more probable interpretation is that suggested by the usage of the same phrase, 1 Sam. 14. 33, 'Then they told Saul, saying, Behold, the people sin against the Lord, in that they eat *with the blood* (על הדם *al haddâm, upon the blood*).' What is meant by this we infer from v. 32, of the same chapter; 'And the people flew upon the spoil, and took sheep and oxen, and calves, and slew them upon the ground, and the people did eat them *with the blood* (על הדם *al haddâm, upon the blood*).' From this it would appear that the phrase to *eat any thing upon the blood*, means to eat the flesh of the animal before it is fully dead, and the blood thoroughly drained from it. Thus Maimonides; 'It is unlawful to eat of a slain beast so long as it trembleth; and he that eateth thereof before the soul (life) of it be gone out, transgresseth against a prohibition, Ye shall not eat upon the blood.'——¶ *Neither shall ye use enchantments.* Heb. לא תנחשו *lo tena'hashu, ye shall not practice augury or divination.* It is the root with which נחש *na'hash, a serpent*, is so intimately connected, and the true force of which is elucidated in the Note on Gen. 3. 1. It refers to the superstitious observance of omens, and perhaps mainly such ceremonies as were understood by the term *ophiomancy*, or *divination by serpents*, similar to which was the art of *ornithomancy*, or *augury by birds.* This is Bochart's opinion, who has gone into the subject, as usual, at great length.——¶ *Nor observe times.* Heb. לא תעוננו *lo teonënu.* The doubtful origin of the word makes the sense doubtful. Aben-Ezra and many others consider the verb as a denominative from the root ענן *ânân, a cloud*, and understand it here to be equivalent to *taking omens from the aspect of the clouds, and other celestial phenomena*—

27 [f] Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard.

[f] ch. 21. 5. Jer. 9. 26, and 48. 37. Isai. 15. 2.

28 Ye shall not [g] make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you: I *am* the LORD.

[g] ch. 21. 5. Deut. 14. 1. Jer. 16. 6, and 48. 37.

a species of divination to which respect seems to be had, Jer. 10. 2, where the prophet forbids the people to be 'dismayed at *the signs of heaven*, at which the heathen are dismayed.' To this interpretation Rosenmuller gives the preference. Jarchi, on the other hand, who is followed by Fuller (Miscel. Sacr. l. 1. c. 16) gives the noun עונה *onĕh* as the etymon which is defined *a set, fixed, or prescribed time*. The phrase, therefore, 'to observe times' is supposed to imply the noting of certain days as more lucky than others, and selecting such as the days on which to commence a journey, or undertake any particular business or enterprise. This is probably the true sense, whether the etymology above suggested be correct or not, about which there is considerable doubt. We may remark that the Gr. has ορνιθοσκοπησεσθε, signifying *augury by birds;* while the Syriac employs a term implying *fascination by the eye*, as if עין *ayin, eye*, were the root. It seems impossible to decide with confidence the exact import. But while we are left in doubt about the precise meaning of a term, we are at no loss to discover the general scope and ground of the precept. The giving heed to vain signs and prognostics, the turning to the delusive arts of astrology, or fortune-telling, would naturally beget a disregard and a practical denial of the doctrine of an over-ruling Providence, which was ever to be an object of cordial belief and unreserved trust to the pious mind.

27. *Ye shall not round the corners of your head.* That is, shall not so shave off the hair of the head around the temples and behind the ears as to leave the head wholly bald, except a dish-like tuft upon the crown. This was in opposition to the usages of the heathen. The precept in the following clause relative to the beard is of equivalent import. They were to let it grow equally over all the lower part of of the face.

28. *Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead.* Heb. לנפש *lenephesh, for a soul;* but this is the sense of the Heb. term in repeated instances, as Lev. 21, Num. 6. 6, Hag. 2. 13. They were not to gash or lacerate their persons in any manner in their mourning ceremonies, as with the vain idea of pacifying or propitiating the infernal spirits in behalf of the dead, a notion very prevalent among the heathen idolaters. Mourning habits they might put on, if they chose, and, with the exception of the high-priest, rend their garments in token of grief; but they were not to disfigure their bodies. This would be utterly unbecoming a people who were instructed to a better knowledge of a future state and of the invisible world than the ignorant heathen could be supposed to possess. ——¶ *Nor print any marks upon you.* 'This is understood to forbid the practice of *tattooing*, that is, by means of colors rubbed over minute punctures made in the skin, to impress certain figures and characters on different parts of the body, and which in general remain indelible throughout life. The figures thus impressed on the arms and breasts of our sailors will serve in some degree to indicate the sort of ornament intended. It is well known to be common among savages and barbarians in almost all climates and countries—the aboriginal inhabitants of our own country not excepted, who, from having their naked bodies profusely ornament-

29 ¶ [h] Do not prostitute thy daughter to cause her to be a whore: lest the land fall to whoredom, and the land become full of wickedness.

[h] Deut. 23. 17.

ed, apparently in this style, were described by the Romans as painted savages. It seems in England to be more commonly regarded as a custom of savage islanders than as any thing more. Yet it is also an Oriental custom; and that too among people whose proximity to the Hebrews affords a reason for the interdiction. The Bedouin Arabs, and those inhabitants of towns who are in any way allied to them, are scarcely less fond of such decorations than any islanders of the Pacific Ocean. This is particularly the case among the females, who in general have their legs and arms, their front from the neck to the waist, and even their chins, noses, lips, and other prominent parts of the face disfigured with blue stains in the form of flowers, circles, bands, stars, and various fanciful figures. They have no figures of living objects, such being forbidden by their religion: neither do they associate any superstitions with them, so far as we were able to ascertain. They probably did both before the Mohammedan era, as their descendants in the island of Malta do at present. The men there generally go about without their jackets, and with their shirt sleeves tucked up above their elbows, and we scarcely recollect ever to have seen an arm thus bare which was not covered with religious emblems and figures of the Virgin, or of some saint under whose immediate protection the person thus marked conceived himself to be. Thus also, persons who visit the holy sepulchre and other sacred places in Palestine, have commonly a mark impressed upon the arm in testimony of their meritorious pilgrimage. The Hindoos also puncture upon their persons representations of birds, trees, and the gods they serve. Among them the representations are sometimes of a highly offensive description. All Hindoos have a black spot, or some other mark, upon their foreheads. It was probably the perversion of such figures to superstitious purposes, or being worn in honor of some idol, which occasioned them to be interdicted in the text before us—if such tattooing is really that which is here intended. As the marks are indelible, we of course, in taking this view, consider that a permanent fashion rather than a temporary mourning usage is here prohibited.'—*P. Bib.*

Against Prostitution.

29. *Do not prostitute thy daughter*, &c. Heb. אל תחלה *al te'hallël, do not make abominable or profane.* Gr. *ου βεβηλωσεις thou shalt not profane, desecrate, or pollute.* This alludes to the abominable custom of the heathen, among whom the women prostituted themselves in their temples as an act of religion. At Babylon this was done, according to Herodotus, by women of all ranks, before they were married; and from the following remarks of Mr. Roberts (Orient. Illust.) it appears that the same depraved practice is still kept up in India.—'Parents, in consequence of a vow or some other circumstance, often dedicate their daughters to the gods. They are sent to the temple, at the age of eight or ten years, to be initiated into the art of dancing before the deities, and of singing songs in honor of their exploits. From that period these dancing girls remain in some sacred building near the temple; and when they arrive at maturity (the parents being made acquainted with the fact), a feast is made, and the poor girl is given into the embraces of some influential man of the establishment. Practices of the most disgusting nature then take place, and the young victim becomes a prostitute for life.' From all such horrid abominations the sanc-

30 ¶ [i] Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and [k] reverence my sanctuary: I *am* the LORD.

31 ¶ [l] Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them: I *am* the LORD your God.

[i] ver. 3. ch. 26. 2. [k] Eccles. 5. 1.

[l] Exod. 22. 18. ch. 20. 6, 27. Deut. 18. 10. 1 Sam. 28. 7. 1 Chron. 10. 13. Isai. 8. 19. Acts 16. 16.

tuary of God was to be kept free, and all licentiousness among the people at large to be discouraged to the utmost. It can hardly be supposed that any parent would be so far lost to all the instincts of natural affection, as knowingly and of set design to surrender a beloved daughter to a life of infamy, degradation, and sin; but he might do this indirectly, by not restraining her from such customs and associations as would tend to lead to it; and it is the usual idiom of the Scriptures to speak of that as *actually done* by a person which he *does not prevent* when it was in the power of his hand to do it. Whether the prohibition is pointed against the exposing of daughters to prostitution as a part of religion, is, we think, considerably doubtful, although it may have been so. But there is no room to question that the explanation above given is true at any rate. Parents were not to prostitute their daughters by *suffering them to be exposed to the danger of prostitution.*

Enjoining Reverence of the Sabbath and the Sanctuary.

30. *Ye shall keep my sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary.* These precepts are doubtless here conjoined from the intimate relation which the observance of the one has to that of the other. Neglect or profanation of the Sabbath not only accompanies, but in great measure consists in, the habitual disregard of the worship of the sanctuary.

Against consulting Wizards and them which have Familiar Spirits.

31. *Regard not them that have familiar spirits.* Heb. אל תפנו אל האבת *al tiphnu el hâoboth, turn not to the oboth.* Go not after them to consult them, nor follow their directions. Gr. *ουκ επακολουθησεσθε, follow not.* We give the term *oboth* without translating, because we have no English word that precisely answers to it. Its literal sense is that of *leathern bottles* or *water-skins*, which would of course be in a state of *distension* or *swelling* when filled with water. This circumstance seems to have been the ground of the application of the term to *sorcerers, necromancers*, or *ventriloquists*, (Gr. *εγγαστριμυθοι, speakers out of the belly*), who, in the practice of their pretended magical rites and incantations, and while under the alleged influence of the inspiring demon, became greatly *inflated*, and in that state uttered their oracles, as if the spirit himself spoke from within them. The Chal. has בדין *biddin, pythons*, to which we have a distinct allusion Acts 16. 16, 'And it came to pass as we went to prayer, a certain damsel *possessed with a spirit of divination* (Gr. *πνευμα πυθωνος, spirit of python*), met us,' &c. Python was a name of Apollo, and this damsel was actuated as his priests or priestesses were supposed to be in delivering oracles at Delphos. She was doubtless of the class of persons denounced in this passage. Grammatically, we suppose, אבות *oboth* in this place requires the supply of the word בעל *baal*, or בעלת *baalath, master* or *mistress of Ob*, as it is expressed 1 Sam. 28. 7, in respect to the witch of Endor, who is called בעלת אוב *baalath ob, mistress of Ob*, but translated in our version one that 'had a familiar spirit.' So by a like figure of speech 'spirits' is used for 'spiritual gifts,' and for those who exercise them, 1 Cor. 14. 12, 32.—1 John

32 ¶ [m] Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man, and [n] fear thy God: I *am* the LORD.

[m] Prov. 20. 29. 1 Tim. 5. 1. [n] ver. 14.

33 ¶ And [o] if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him.

[o] Exod. 22. 21, and 23. 9.

4. 1.——¶ *Neither seek after wizards.* Heb. ידענים *yiddeonim, knowing ones.* The term in its radical meaning implies *knowledge* (from ידע *yâda, to know*), and is here applied to men as the preceding is to women. It is agreed that the word denotes generally those who, by means of magical and cabalistic arts, professed to become acquainted with future events, to know the good or evil that awaited human life. They are joined with the masters or possessors of 'familiar spirits' above-mentioned, as like them in sin, and both were to be put to death by the magistrate, according to ch. 20. 27, which contains the penalty of this crime. 'A man also or a woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood shall be upon them.' The reason for this precept's coming in juxta-position with the former enjoining reverence of the sanctuary is thus intimated in the paraphrase of R. Chazkuni:—'Ye shall reverence my sanctuary; therefore turn not to them that have familiar spirits, nor to wizards; for what have you to do with such? Behold, you have a sanctuary wherein is Urim and Thummim.'

Respect to be shown to the Aged.

32. *Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head.* Heb. מפני שיבה *mippenë shëbâh, before the greyness* or *hoariness;* the abstract for the concrete, as in numerous other instances. Chal. 'Him that is skilful in the law.' How much praise have the Spartan institutions justly obtained for cherishing this principle, yet how much more energetic and authoritative is the language of the Jewish code, coming as it does directly from Jehovah himself! In commanding reverence to be paid to the aged, he in fact ordains it to that which is a feeble image of his own eternity. He is denominated the 'Ancient of days,' and when he is represented as having 'the hair of his head like the pure wool,' he is pleased to represent himself as having the distinguishing characteristic of old age. There is probably no object in creation so fitted to inspire reverence as the sight of the snowy locks of the old man, and consequently the duty here enjoined has been recognized in all civilized nations, as one the violation of which is deserving of the severest punishment. Even a heathen Juvenal (Sat. 13.) could say—'Hoc grande nefas, et morte piandum, si juvenis vetulo non assurrexerat.'——¶ *And fear thy God.* Heb. יראת מאלהיך *yârëthâ mëelohëkâ, fear from* (before) *thy gods.* That is, as many of the Jewish writers understand it, *reverence thy judges or magistrates,* who are repeatedly called אלהים *Elohim, gods,* in the sacred writings. They suppose accordingly that there are three degrees or ranks of men implied in this verse towards each of which becoming tokens of honor and reverence are here expressly enjoined; (1.) the aged in general; (2.) the wise and learned; (3.) judges and magistrates. But if taken as read in our translation, it clearly shows how intimate is the connexion in God's sight, between a devout fear of himself and a becoming reverence of those who are his most natural representatives to the eyes of mortals.

The Stranger not to be oppressed.

33. *If a stranger sojourn with thee in your land ye shall not vex him.* Heb. לא תונו אתו *lo tonu otho, ye shall not afflict, oppress him.* Gr. ου θλιψετε αυτον

34 p *But* the stranger that dwelleth with you, shall be unto you as one born among you, and q thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I *am* the LORD your God.

35 ¶ r Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in mete-yard, in weight, or in measure.

36 s Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin shall ye have: I *am* the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt.

37 t Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: I *am* the LORD.

p Exod. 12. 48, 49. q Deut. 10. 19. r ver. 15. s Deut. 25. 13, 15. Prov. 11. 1, and 16. 11, and 20. 10.

t ch. 18. 4, 5. Deut. 4. 5, 6, and 5. 1, and 6. 25.

CHAPTER XX.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

ye shall not afflict him. By the Targum of Jonathan and by Sol. Jarchi, it is understood of *vexations of words*, such as saying to him, 'Yesterday thou wast an idolater, and now thou comest to learn the law which was given from the mouth of God.' It is supposed that the stranger was not an idolater, but a worshipper of the God of Israel, though not circumcised; a proselyte of righteousness. If such an one sojourned among them, they must not vex him, nor oppress, nor overreach him in a bargain, taking advantage of his ignorance of their laws and customs; they must reckon it as great a sin to cheat a stranger, as to cheat an Israelite. As all men are children of one common father, it argues a generous disposition and a pious regard to God to show kindness to strangers.

Enjoining just Measures, Weights, and Balances.

35. *Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment.* The word 'judgment' in this connexion is very plausibly referred by the Hebrew writers to all the particulars that follow. On this construction it is held, that Moses uses the word here in order to intimate of what solemn moment he would have the law considered, which relates to true measures and weights. The man that falsified either was to be regarded as a *corrupter of judgment*, an emphatic designation, equivalent to vile, wicked, abominable in a very high degree.——¶ *In mete-yard.* Heb. במדה *bammiddâh;* a measure of *length* or *surface*, such as the yard, cubit, foot, span, &c. ——¶ *In weight.* Heb. במשקל *bammishkol;* such as the talent, shekel, &c.——¶ *In measure.* Heb. במשורה *bammesurâh;* by which is denoted measures of capacity, such as the homer, ephah, seah, hin, &c. In all these articles, as well as in the balances or scales, weight-stones, &c., mentioned in the next verse, they were to observe the most honest exactness, and never allow themselves to practise any species of fraud in their dealings and commerce, because they might not think it of easy detection.

In view of the general contents of this chapter, who can but feel how admirable are such language and sentiments, and how suited to the sacred original from which they flow! How strongly do they attest the divine benevolence which dictated the Jewish law, and the divine authority which alone could enforce such precepts by adequate sanctions, and impress such sentiments upon the human heart with practical conviction!

CHAPTER XX.

The principal scope of the present chapter is to specify the punishments which it pleased God to annex to the transgression of the laws contained in the two preceding chapters. As we

2 [a] Again thou shalt say to the children of Israel, [b] Whosoever *he be* of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that giveth *any* of his seed unto Molech, he shall surely be put to death: the people of the land shall stone him with stones.

3 And [c] I will set my face against that man, and will cut him off from among his people; because he hath given of his seed unto Molech, to [d] defile my sanctuary, and [e] to profane my holy name.

[a] ch. 18. 21. [b] ch. 18. 21. Deut. 12. 31, and 18. 10. 2 Kings 17. 17, and 23. 10. 2 Chron. 33. 6. Jer. 7. 31, and 32. 35. Ezek. 20. 26, 31

[c] ch. 17. 10. [d] Ezek. 5. 11, and 23. 38, 39 [e] ch. 18. 21.

---

have already had occasion to consider most of them in connexion with the parallel precepts in ch. 18, there remains little to be said by way of additional comment.

Against the giving of Seed to Molech.

2. *Whosoever he be*, &c. Heb. אִישׁ אִישׁ *a man, a man.* The law had respect as much to proselytes who had embraced the Hebrew faith, as to native Israelites.——¶ *That giveth any of his seed unto Molech.* That is, any of his children. On the name and character of this idol, see note on Lev. 18. 21.——¶ *He shall be surely put to death.* Heb. מוֹת יוּמָת *moth yumâth, dying he shall be made to die.* So afterwards, in vv. 9, 10, 11, 12, &c.——¶ *The people of the land.* That is, the inhabitants of that region in which he dwells. Chal. 'The people of the house of Israel.'——¶ *Shall stone him with stones.* This was the principal capital punishment in use among the Jews, and the mode of it was as follows:—When the criminal arrived within four cubits of the place of execution, he was stripped naked, except a slight covering about the loins, and his hands being bound, he was led up to the fatal spot, which was an eminence about twice the height of a man. The first executioners of the sentence were the witnesses, who generally pulled off their clothes for that purpose. One of them threw him down with great violence upon his loins; if he rolled upon his breast, he was turned upon his loins again; and if he died by the fall, the sentence of the law was executed; but if not, the other witness took a great stone and dashed it on his breast as he lay upon his back; and then, if he was not despatched, all the people that stood by, threw stones at him till he died.

3. *I will set my face against that man.* Heb. אֶתֵּן *ettĕn, will give;* i. e. will oppose, will fix firmly my face; for which we have in v. 5 another and more appropriate original word for *set* (שָׂמְתִּי *samti*). It might reasonably be asked, in what sense God here threatens the cutting off an offender, who is at the same time represented as having been stoned to death in the preceding verse. To this it is answered by the Jewish critics, that the meaning is, that where the sin was not known, or there was not a sufficient amount of proof to convict the offender of the crime, there God would interpose, and by his own act 'cut him off,' by some extraordinary judgment, from among his people. But as this case would seem rather to be included in that mentioned vv. 4, 5, we prefer to consider the punishment denounced in this passage as identical with the 'stoning' of v. 2. The Most High declares that *in this way* his judicial purpose shall be executed. The threatening is of fearful import. That infliction must be awful indeed, in which the sufferer sees the human agents merely carrying into effect a divine sentence which decrees his destruction. ——¶ *To defile my sanctuary;*—which which was defiled when God was professedly worshipped in any other place or in any other manner than he had commanded; or when sacrifices were

4 And if the people of the land do any ways hide their eyes from the man, when he giveth of his seed unto Molech, and [f] kill him not;

5 Then [g] I will set my face against that man, and [h] against his family, and will cut him off, and all that [i] go a whoring after him, to commit whoredom with Molech, from among their people.

[f] Deut. 17. 2, 3, 5. [g] ch. 17. 10. [h] Exod. 20. 5. [i] ch. 17. 7.

6 ¶ And [k] the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people.

7 ¶ [l] Sanctify yourselves therefore and be ye holy: for I *am* the LORD your God.

8 [m] And ye shall keep my statutes,

[k] ch. 19. 31. [l] ch. 11. 44, and 19. 2. 1 Pet. 1. 16. [m] ch. 19. 37.

offered by his people to false gods; inasmuch as the temple of God hath no agreement with idols.——¶ *And to profane my holy name.* Heb. לחלל *le'hallël*, the same word as that employed Lev. 19. 29, 'Do not *prostitute* (תחלל *te'hallël*) thy daughter,' &c. The name of God is profaned, desecrated, made abominable, when the honor and reverence due to him alone is lavished upon idols. See Note on Lev. 18. 21.

4. *If the people of the land do any ways hide their eyes.* Heb. העלם העלימו *ha'lïm ya'lim, hiding do hide.* Gr. *υπεροψει υπεριδωσιν, with winking shall wink at;* i. e. shall overlook, disregard, neglect to punish. The Gr. word is the same with that occurring, Acts 17. 30, 'And the times of this ignorance God *winked at* (*υπεριδων*), but now commandeth,' &c.

5. *Then I will set my face*, &c. Chal. 'I will set mine anger against that man and his helpers.' Because others might wickedly connive at his offence, let him not therefore promise himself impunity. The eye of Omniscience would still be upon him, and the hand which no power could stay or elude would single him out for its stroke; and not him only, but the judgment, according to the usual analogy of Providence, would embrace the circle of his family, and involve others in its desolating effects. See Note on Joshua, 7. 15.——¶ *His family.* Gr. *την συγγενειαν αυτου, his kindred.* ——¶ *All that go a whoring after him.* Chal. 'All who err after him;' the usual term for expressing *idolatrous apostacy* in that version. Gr. *παντας τους ὁμονοουντας αυτῳ, all who consent with him.* The language is founded upon the peculiarly near and intimate relation, amounting in fact to a kind of conjugal union, between God and his covenant people, an infraction of which on their part was a virtual act of adultery.

Of consulting Wizards.

6. *The soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits*, &c. The nature of the sin here alluded to has been already explained, Lev. 19, 31. The punishment denounced is the same judicial 'cutting off' which we have before had frequent occasion to consider, and of which a fuller exposition will be found in the Note on Gen. 17. 14. The case of Saul affords a melancholy instance of the execution of this fearful sentence; 1 Chron. 10. 13, 14, 'And Saul died for his transgression which he committed against the Lord, even against the word of the Lord, which he kept not, and also for asking counsel of one that had a familiar spirit, to inquire of it; and inquired not of the Lord; therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David.' As the act forbidden was in its own nature idolatrous, it is characterized by the same opprobrious term as that which is applied in the preceding verse to the service of Molech.

7. *Sanctify yourselves therefore*, &c.

and do them: [n] I *am* the LORD which sanctify you.

9 ¶ [o] For every one that curseth his father or his mother, shall be surely put to death: he hath cursed his father or his mother: [p] his blood *shall be* upon him.

10 ¶ And [q] the man that committeth adultery with *another* man's wife, *even he* that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death.

11 [r] And the man that lieth with his father's wife, hath uncovered his father's nakedness: both of them shall surely be put to death: their blood *shall be* upon them.

12 [s] And if a man lie with his daughter-in-law, both of them shall

[n] Exod. 31. 13. ch. 21. 8. Ezek. 37 28. [o] Exod. 21. 17. Deut. 27. 16. Prov. 20. 20. Matt. 15. 4. [p] ver. 11, 12, 13, 16, 27. 2 Sam. 1. 16. [q] ch. 18. 20. Deut. 22. 22. John 8. 4, 5.

[r] ch. 18. 8. Deut. 27. 23. [s] ch. 18. 15.

This is not properly to be regarded as a separate and independent precept, but rather as an appendix to the preceding. The *sanctity* especially enjoined upon the chosen people consisted in great measure in their *separation* from the corrupt and idolatrous practices of the surrounding heathen; and nothing was more natural than that such an injunction should follow in close connexion a precept expressly denouncing a particular form of idolatrous usage. It is as if he had said, 'Instead of conforming to these abominable and wicked rites, and thus contaminating yourselves with the guilt of necromancy and other magical arts, sanctify yourselves, i. e. keep yourselves aloof from all fellowship with these works of iniquity; remember that ye are called to be a chosen and holy and peculiar people, for the Lord your God, whose ye are, is a holy God, infinitely separated from all these lying vanities which the heathen worship as gods.'

Of cursing Parents.

9. *For every one that curseth his father or his mother*, &c. Heb. יְקַלֵּל *yekallĕl*; of the genuine force of this word which radically signifies *to make light of*, and refers to any kind of speech which has a tendency to lessen our parents in the eyes of others, or in any way to bring contempt upon them. See what is said in the Note on the fifth commandment, Ex. 20. 12. The verse is introduced by the illative 'for' as indicative of its close connexion with the precept contained in the preceding verse; 'Be ye holy, and keep all my statutes, or otherwise my judgments will fall upon you, *for* every one that curseth, &c., shall be surely put to death;' or as the Heb. has it, מוֹת יוּמָת *moth yumath*, *dying shall be made to die*. The precise mode of execution is not specified, but it is understood to be by stoning. This form of capital punishment is uniformly to be understood where no other is stated.——¶ *He hath cursed his father or his mother.* This is repeated as by a kind of note of exclamation, to aggravate the enormity of the crime. He shall be put to death, for, with utter amazement be it said, he hath cursed his father or his mother!! such a monster must surely die. ——¶ *His blood shall be upon him.* That is, he shall be put to death as a malefactor justly condemned to die; one who has brought his guilt upon his own head, and who can blame none but himself for the consequences. Chal. 'He is guilty of death,' i. e. worthy to be killed. Gr. ενοχος εσται, *he shall be guilty*. The death in this and all such cases was *stoning*. 'Every place where it is said in the law, 'they shall be put to death; their blood (be) upon them,' it is meant, by stoning.'—*Maimonides in Ainsworth.*

10. See on Lev. 18. 20.

11. See on Lev. 18. 8.

surely be put to death: [t] they have wrought confusion; their blood *shall be* upon them.

13 [u] If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them.

14 [x] And if a man take a wife and her mother, it *is* wickedness: they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they: that there be no wickedness among you.

15 [y] And if a man lie with a beast, he shall surely be put to death: and ye shall slay the beast.

16 And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman and the beast; they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them.

17 [z] And if a man shall take his sister, his father's daughter, or his mother's daughter, and see her nakedness, and she see his nakedness:

[t] ch. 18. 23. [u] ch. 18. 22. Deut. 23. 17. See Gen. 19. 5. Judg. 19. 22. [x] ch. 18. 17. Deut. 27. 23. [y] ch. 18. 23. Deut. 27. 21. [z] ch. 18. 9. Deut. 27. 22. See Gen. 20. 12.

it *is* a wicked thing; and they shall be cut off in the sight of their people: he hath uncovered his sister's nakedness; he shall bear his iniquity.

18 [a] And if a man shall lie with a woman having her sickness, and shall uncover her nakedness; he hath discovered her fountain, and she hath uncovered the fountain of her blood: and both of them shall be cut off from among their people.

19 [b] And thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister, nor of thy father's sister: [c] for he uncovereth his near kin: they shall bear their iniquity.

20 [d] And if a man shall lie with his uncle's wife, he hath uncovered his uncle's nakedness: they shall bear their sin: they shall die childless.

21 [e] And if a man shall take his brother's wife, it *is* an unclean thing: he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness; they shall be childless.

22 ¶ Ye shall therefore keep all

[a] ch. 18. 19. See ch. 15. 24. [b] ch. 18, 12, 13. [c] ch. 18. 6. [d] ch. 18. 14. [e] ch. 18. 16.

12. See on Lev. 18. 15.

13. See on Lev. 18. 22.

14. See on Lev. 18. 17.——¶ *They shall be burnt with fire.* That is, after being stoned. See Note on Josh. 7. 15.

15, 16. See on Lev. 18. 23.

17. See on Lev. 18. 9.

18. See on Lev. 18. 19.

19. See on Lev. 18. 12.

20. See on Lev. 18. 14.

21. See on Lev. 18. 16.——¶ *They shall be childless.* 'This does not mean,' says Michaelis, 'that God would miraculously prevent the procreation of children from such a marriage; for God no where promises any continual miracle of this nature; but only that the children proceeding from it should not be put to their account in the public registers; so that in a civil sense they would be childless. The Heb. word עֲרִירִי *ariri, unfruitful*, has this meaning, and is applied to the case of a man who has children, but will not be heired by them. Thus in Jer. 22. 30, it is said of a king who certainly had children, though they did not receive his inheritance, 'Inscribe this man as childless; for of his posterity none shall prosper, nor any sit upon the throne of David.' For the children of such a marriage would be ascribed to the deceased brother; and that, among the Israelites, where a man made so much of the honor of being called *father*, was a very sensible punishment.' The LXX, Augustine, and Aben-Ezra, understood our text in this manner.'—*Comment on L. of M.* § 116. It must be admitted to be not a little remarkable, that God

my [f]statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: that the land whither I bring you to dwell therein, [g]spue you not out.

23 [h]And ye shall not walk in the manners of the nations which I cast out before you: for they committed all these things, and [i]therefore I abhorred them.

24 But [k]I have said unto you, Ye shall inherit their land, and I will give it unto you to possess it, a land that floweth with milk and honey: I *am* the LORD your God, [l]which have separated you from *other* people.

25 [m]Ye shall therefore put difference between clean beasts and unclean, and between unclean fowls and clean: [n]and ye shall not make your souls abominable by beast or by fowl, or by any manner of living thing that creepeth on the ground, which I have separated from you as unclean.

26 And ye shall be holy unto me: [o]for I the LORD *am* holy, and [p]have severed you from *other* people, that ye should be mine.

27 ¶ [q]A man also or a woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: [r]their blood *shall be* upon them.

[f] ch 18. 26, and 19. 37. [g] ch. 18. 25, 28. [h] ch 18. 3, 24, 30. [i] ch. 18. 27. Deut. 9. 5. [k] Exod. 3. 17, and 6. 8. [l] ver. 26. Exod. 19. 5, and 33. 16. Deut. 7. 6, and 14. 2. 1 Kings 8. 53. [m] ch. 11. 47. Deut. 14. 4.

[n] ch. 11. 43. [o] ver. 7. ch. 19. 2. 1 Pet. 1. 16. [p] ver. 24. Tit. 2. 14. [q] ch. 19. 31. Exod 22. 18. Deut. 18. 10, 11. 1 Sam. 28. 7, 8. [r] ver. 9.

---

should here threaten a punishment to be inflicted by his own special interposition, when in every other case mentioned he ordered it to be done by the agency of the magistrate. This gives considerable plausibility to the suggestion above quoted; viz. that their children should be bastardized; at the same time, we cannot perceive that the case allows of so much positiveness of tone as is evident in the language of Michaelis.

Exhortations to Obedience.

23. *They committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them.* Heb. וַאֶקְץ בָּם *vâ-âkutz bâm, and I was vexed with them.* Ainsworth; 'I am irked with them.' Chal. 'My Word abhorreth them.' The language employed has a fearful emphasis of import. It is much for the infinite Jehovah to say that he will punish men for their transgressions; but for him to say that he *abhors* them, that they are an offence and an abomination to him, is calculated not only to give us a most affecting idea of the hatefulness of their sin, but also of the degree of their punishment. For when the emotion in the divine mind is *abhorrence*, what must be the action of the divine judgments? It will be seen that the great argument by which the peculiar people are urged to obedience is the fact that they had been *separated* by a kind of holy external sequestration from all other people, and they were consequently in like manner to be separated by a pre-eminent sanctity of life, spirit, and demeanor. Their conduct was to correspond with their distinction, and if God says by the prophet (Is. 49. 2), 'Thou art my servant, O Israel, I will be glorious in thee,' they were so to govern their deportment as to verify the declaration. And surely when the Most High makes his people the depositaries of his glory, they have a motive to obedience than which it is impossible to conceive any stronger.

CHAPTER XXI.

Rules regulating the Priests' Mourning.

As the two or three previous chapters contain a mass of general rules enjoining sanctity upon the people at large, we have here a special law pertaining

CHAPTER XXI.

AND the LORD said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron, and say unto them, [a] There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people:

2 But for his kin, that is near unto him, *that is*, for his mother, and for his father, and for his son, and for his daughter, and for his brother,

3 And for his sister a virgin, that is nigh unto him, which hath had

[a] Ezek. 44. 25.

to the priests. As it was their office to make atonement, and see to the general purity of the people, it was important that they should study the greatest degree of personal purity themselves. The special ministers of the Most High were to keep themselves at a distance from every thing that savored in the least of uncleanness in the estimation of the people, lest they should countenance that which they were set apart to prevent.

1. *There shall none be defiled for the dead.* Heb. לנפש *lenephesh*; a term in repeated instances applied to a *dead body*. Gr. *εν ταις ψυχαις*, *for souls*. The spirit of the passage forbids that any priest should assist at laying out a dead body, or preparing it for interment. This defilement was contracted not only by touching a dead body, but by coming into a tent or house where a dead body lay, by touching the grave, or by bearing the dead. In such a case they became legally polluted for the space of seven days, Num. 19. 11, 14, and consequently disqualified for the service of God, and interdicted from converse with their fellow Israelites. According to the Heb. canons, this effect followed if one came within four cubits, or six feet, of the dead. Of the reasons of this prohibition, it may not be possible to speak with assurance. Leclerc observes, 'Perhaps the chief reason why a human corpse was adjudged to be unclean was, because it speedily becomes putrid, especially in a hot climate; whence those who aspired to a special cleanness above others, abstained from any contact with it.' Bochart has collected a large mass of evidence to prove that the ancient Greeks and Romans held that defilement was contracted from the same source.

2. *But for his kin that is near unto him.* Heb. לשארו הקרב אליו *lishëro hakkarob ëlauv, his remainder (of flesh) that is near unto him.* See the import of this term explained in the Note on Lev. 18. 6. Compare also Ezek. 44. 25. The rule here laid down constitutes, of course, an exception to the general statute, founded upon a kind regard to the natural sympathies which grow out of the various tender relationships of life. It would have been an extreme privation for one of the priestly order to have been prohibited from paying the last offices of affection to a parent, a child, a brother, or sister. It is a beautiful exemplification of the great principle that God would 'have mercy and not sacrifice,' where the claims of both came in competition. The wife, it will be seen, is not expressly mentioned in this catalogue of kindred, but that she was included by implication, no one can doubt. And this, by the way, affords a strong confirmation of the principle we have before insisted upon in the interpretation of the marriage-laws, in Lev. 18., that the *implied* cases are equally forbidden with the *express*. The case of the prophet Ezekiel, ch. 24. 16–18, is here directly in point. It was no doubt in virtue of an express command, suspending for the time being the operation of this law, that he was forbidden to exhibit the usual signals of mourning for his deceased wife, which would otherwise have been lawful for him.

3. *Which hath had no husband.* Whereas, had she been married, it would have been the duty of the sur-

no husband: for her may he be defiled.

4 *But* he shall not defile himself, *being* a chief man among his people, to profane himself.

5 [b] They shall not make baldness upon their head, neither shall they shave off the corner of their beard, nor make any cuttings in their flesh.

6 They shall be holy unto their God, and [c] not profane the name of their God: for the offerings of the

[b] ch. 19. 27, 28. Deut. 14. 1. Ezek. 44. 20.

[c] ch. 18. 21, and 19. 12.

viving husband to see to the performance of all the requisite rites at her burial, so that the priest her brother would have been excused.

4. *He shall not defile himself being a chief man among his people.* Heb. בעל בעמיו *baal beammauv*, which (by supplying the probable ellipsis of ל *for*), may be rendered 'for a chief man.' Chal. רבא *rabba, a master*. That is, he shall not thus defile himself for any one that is not near of kin to him, though the dead person were a chief or the chiefest man among his people, even the high priest himself. This is the version of the Vulg. Syr. and Arab., and is adopted by Ainsworth, Gill, Patrick, Dathe, Scott, A. Clarke, and others. The Gr. has strangely εξαπινα, *suddenly*, which has probably arisen from some blunder in the reading of the original. As בעל *baal* signifies in general a lord, master, possessor, and is sometimes applied to 'master of a house,' the idea of Willet is not improbable, who thinks the meaning to be, that the priest, the master of the house, should mourn for none of the inmates except those mentioned above. Accordingly Luther renders it, 'He shall not defile himself for any one who belongs to him. The marginal reading which Rosenmuller after Leclerc adopts, gives entirely another complexion to the passage;—'Being a husband among his people, he shall not defile himself (for his wife),' &c. This makes it an express prohibition of mourning for a wife, for which construction we can perceive no adequate grounds either in the nature of the case or the structure of the passage. But the matter is not of sufficient moment to warrant an extended critical discussion. We on the whole prefer the interpretation suggested by Willet, and confirmed by Luther.

6. *They shall not make baldness on their heads*, &c. This was enacted that they might not adopt the customs of the heathen, of whom it is said in the apocryphal book of Baruch, 6. 31, that 'their priests sit in their temples, with their clothes rent, and their heads and beards shaven, and having nothing upon their heads; and they roar and cry before their gods, as men do at the feast where is dead.' See Note on Lev. 19. 27, 28. 'In ch. 19. 28, this is made a general law, not peculiar to the priests. They are here forbidden to do that which had already been prohibited to the people in general. There is a difference of opinion as to the interpretation of the text. Some think that it is to be understood generally, as interdicting the shaving of the beard. If thus understood, there seems an adequate reason for it in the contrary practice of the Egyptians, who did shave their beards; and its repetition to the priests may have been to show them that they were not exempted from the general law, as they might have been led to conclude from having observed the peculiar scrupulosity of the Egyptian priests on this point, who, as we are informed by Herodotus, were particularly careful to shave *all* the hair off their bodies every third day. The other alternative is that which has the sanction of our translation, and by which it appears we are to understand the whiskers, or upper extremities of the beard. The object would then appear to be to keep them a distinct people from the Arabs, who either shaved their whis-

LORD made by fire, *and* [d] the bread of their God they do offer: therefore they shall be holy.

7 [e] They shall not take a wife

[d] See ch. 3. 11. [e] Ezek. 44. 22.

that is a whore, or profane; neither shall they take a woman [f] put away from her husband: for he *is* holy unto his God.

[f] See Deut. 24. 1, 2.

kers or cropped them short. We must not forget that it was one great object of many of the Mosaic laws to keep the Israelites separate from all the neighboring nations; and, whether the Egyptians or the Arabs were in view, it is certain that a different fashion of the beard would have a more marked effect in assisting such a distinction than can be readily calculated by those who hold that appendage in light esteem. That such a distinction as we have mentioned did exist, is not only manifested by existing usages, but by ancient accounts. Mohammed perceived the effect of this distinction—for many Jews resided in Arabia in his time—and strictly enjoined that it should be kept up. According to the traditions, he used to clip his own whiskers; and frequently said, 'He who does not lessen his whiskers is not our ways:' and he expressly said that he inculcated this practice in opposition to the Jews, who were not accustomed to clip either their beards or whiskers. In these counter regulations we seem here to perceive the object of the apparently trivial injunction of the Hebrew legislator.'—*Pict. Bib.*

6. *The offerings of the Lord made by fire and the bread of their God, do they offer.* Heb. אשי יהוה לחם אלהיהם *ishë Yehovuh le'hem elohëhem, the fire*-(offerings) *of Jehovah*, (even) *the food of their God.* Thus by a bold figure of speech are the sacrificial offerings denominated, which were devoured by fire to the honor of God, and nothing could well be said tending to give a higher idea of their office, or consequently to impose upon them more solemnly the duty of an exemplary sanctity in all their deportment. As the Israelites in general were separated from all other nations to be an holy people to the Most High, so the priests and Levites were in a manner separated from the rest of the Israelites with a like intent.

Restrictions in respect to a Priest's marrying.

7. *They shall not take a wife*, &c. The two words in the original are זנה *zonah*, and חללה *hallâlâh*, of which the latter, rendered *profane*, signifies, according to the Jews, not so much one that had been *profaned* or *dishonored*, in which case it would not differ essentially from the preceding, as one who was born of such a marriage as was forbidden to the priests. For as it appears from v. 9, that a daughter might *profane* her father, so a parent, on the other hand, might *profane* a daughter, and so disqualify her from marrying a priest. The daughter of a widow by a high priest, for example, would come under this denomination (v. 14) and so also the daughter of a divorced woman, by the present verse. As the Gr., however, has βεβηλωμενην, *profaned*, a sense quite as probable is, one that has been violated against her will, and that is not a voluntary prostitute, like the זנה *zonah*. The use of the epithet carries with it the striking implication that chastity invests the person with a peculiar *sacredness*, and that it cannot be lost without the *desecration* and *profanation* of that which is in a sense *holy*, like a consecrated temple.——¶ *A woman put away.* Heb. אשה גרושה *ishâh gerushâh, a woman driven away.* Gr. εκβεβλημενην, *cast out.* The Heb. term is stronger than that (משלח *meshala'h*) which is usually applied to the simple dismission involved in divorce. Yet there is no doubt that the 'putting away' here mentioned, was by

8 Thou shalt sanctify him therefore, for he offereth the bread of thy God: he shall be holy unto thee: g for I the LORD which sanctify you, *am* holy.

g ch. 20. 7, 8.

9 ¶ h And the daughter of any priest, if she profane herself by playing the whore, she profaneth her father: she shall be burnt with fire.

h Gen. 38. 24.

means of a divorce. The presumption always was that a woman repudiated among the Israelites, was put away from her husband for some fault. It was not decorous, therefore, for a priest to blemish his good name by marrying a woman who lay under a suspicion of something bad.——¶ *He is holy unto his God.* Set apart and consecrated in a peculiar manner to the service of God, and therefore not allowed to bring discredit upon his office by doing any thing of dubious character.

8. *Thou shalt sanctify him therefore.* That is, thou, Israel, shalt, one and all, hold and repute him as holy, and shalt do all in thy power to keep up the sacred estimation in which, for his office's sake, he is held. It is possible, however, that the address may be intended to be made to Moses, who was to sanctify the priest by commanding him to be sanctified, according to a very frequent idiom.

Of the Priest's Daughter who profanes herself.

9. *The daughter of any priest.* Heb. אישׁ כהן *ish kohën, a man a priest.* There is great unanimity among the Jewish commentators in understanding this of a woman who was married, or at least espoused. 'Our rabbins,' say Aben Ezra and Sol. Jarchi, 'confess with one mouth that one not espoused is not concerned in this law.' But as the letter of the law contains no such limitation, it is doubtless safe to take it in its widest import. She is said by such conduct to pollute her father's name; whereas if she were married, the wrong would be rather done to her husband.——¶ *She profaneth her father,* that is, brings disgrace upon him. Gr. το ονομα του πατρος αυτης αυτη βεβηλοι, *she profaneth her father's name.* Chal. 'She profaneth her father's holiness.' By Sol. Jarchi it is thus explained: 'She profaneth and contemneth his honor, for that men will say of him, Cursed is he that begat this woman; Cursed is he that brought her up.'——¶ *She shall be burnt with fire.* 'It seems, upon the whole, very doubtful whether this and other texts of the same import in the early books of the Old Testament, express the punishment of burning *alive,* or of the ignominious burning of the body *after* execution. It is certain we have no instance of the former punishment; but we have of the latter, as resulting from such a law as that expressed in the text. Thus in Josh 7. 15, it is declared that the unknown person who had taken of the accursed thing should be 'burnt with fire;' and when the man was discovered, we find that this intention was executed not by burning him alive, but by stoning him first and *then* burning his remains (v. 15). We therefore lean to the opinion, that stoning, being the common and well-known punishment, is *understood* in these texts, and that only the additional punishment of burning the body is expressed. Michaelis thinks that burning alive was not sanctioned by the Mosaic law; but Horne, who generally follows him, seems to consider that *both* burning alive and burning after death are among the punishments mentioned by Moses; and it is rather odd that he cites the same texts in proof of both—namely, the one before us and that in the next chapter. The testimony of the Rabbins is worth very little in this matter, as many capital punishments were in later times introduced, of

10 [i] And *he that is* the high priest among his brethren, upon whose head the anointing oil was poured, and [k] that is consecrated to put on the garments, [l] shall not uncover his head, nor rend his clothes;

[i] Exod. 29. 29, 30. ch. 8. 12, and 16. 32. Numb. 35. 25. [k] Exod. 28. 2. ch. 16. 32. [l] ch. 10. 6.

11 Neither shall he [m] go in to any dead body, nor defile himself for his father or his mother;

12 [n] Neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, nor profane the sanctuary of his God; for [o] the

[m] Numb. 19. 14. See ver. 1, 2. [n] ch. 10 7. [o] Exod. 29. 36. ch. 8. 9, 12, 30.

which the law of Moses takes no notice. They say, that because the bodies of Nadab and Abihu were not consumed by the fire which slew them, it was thought unlawful to burn a criminal alive; but that he was put to death by melted lead being poured down his throat. We may accept this so far as to show that persons were not consumed alive in the fire; but we are bound to reject the other part, as wholly unsanctioned by the law of Moses. It is possible that they may had this punishment in after times, when the meaning of the law had been greatly perverted by absurd glosses and inferences.'—*Pict. Bib.*

Rules regulating the Conduct of the High Priest.

10. *He that is the high priest among his brethren.* Heb. הכהן הגדול מאחיו *hakkohĕn haggâdol mĕe'hauv, the priest (that is) great among his brethren,* or, *greater than his brethren.* Gr. *ὁ ἱερευς ὁ μεγας, the great priest;* from which the apostle, Heb. 4. 14, applies the same title to Christ, of whom the Jewish high priest was a distinguished type. Sustaining, therefore, this high character, the Hebrew pontiff was to be more especially studious of his sanctity, both in avoiding defilement by the dead, and in his marriage. This, by the way, is the first time the title occurs in this form in the Scriptures.——¶ *That is consecrated to put on the garments.* That is, the golden garments, as they were called, which were peculiar to the high priest, and of which a full account is given, Ex. 28. The Heb. phrase for 'consecrated' is 'whose hand is filled,' i. e with sacrifices for offering, as the Chal explains it, which the Gr. expresses by the word *τελειοω, to perfect.* See the true import illustrated in the note on Ex. 29. 9.——¶ *Shall not uncover his head.* Heb. ראשו אל יפרע *rosho al yiphrâ, shall not make free his head;* i. e. shall not suffer his hair to go dishevelled and neglected, without trimming, in token of mourning. See the true force of the original term elucidated, Judg. 5. 2. Chal. 'Let not his locks grow.' Gr. *ουκ αποκιδαρωσει, let him not put off his mitre.* See Note on Lev. 10. 6.

11. *Neither shall he go in to any dead body.* Heb. על כל נפשת מת *al kol naphshoth mëth, to any souls of the dead.* Gr. *επι πασαν ψυχην τετελευτηκυιαν, to any soul that has died.* Another instance in which the usual Heb. and Gr. terms for 'soul' are used to signify 'body.' See Note on Lev. 21. 1. The interdict here was very rigorous. He was not permitted to go into the house where his father or mother lay dead, though this was allowed to the inferior priests.

12. *Neither shall he go out of the sanctuary,* &c. That is, during the time that he was officially engaged in the services of the sanctuary. It mattered not who of his family died; he was not to leave his post till his ministrations were finished. It is intimated that by so doing he would '*profane* the sanctuary of his God,' i. e. would constructively profane it by showing that he thought more of earthly relation-

crown of the anointing oil of his God *is* upon him: I *am* the LORD.

13 And [p] he shall take a wife in her virginity.

14 A widow, or a divorced woman, or profane, *or* an harlot, these shall he not take: but he shall take a virgin of his own people to wife.

15 Neither shall he profane his seed among his people: for [q] I the LORD do sanctify him.

16 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

17 Speak unto Aaron, saying, Whosoever *he be* of thy seed in their generations that hath *any* blemish, let him not [r] approach to offer the bread of his God:

[p] ver. 7. Ezek. 44. 22.

[q] ver. 8. [r] ch. 10. 3. Numb. 16. 5. Ps. 64. 4. ch. 3. 11.

ships than of his sacred functions; that he postponed his duty as a priest to his promptings as a man. The Gr. has *εκ των ἁγίων, from the holy things.*——¶ *For the crown of the anointing oil of his God is upon him.* Heb. נזר שמן משחת *nëzer shemen mish'hath*, which may be understood in two ways; either of the golden plate which is called נזר *nëzer, a crown*, Ex. 29. 6, and the anointing oil; or the latter may be simply exegetical of the former, and oil may be called *nëzer, a crown* or *separation*, because it was by it that he was separated from other men and other priests. So the Gr. evidently understands it, which has nothing answering to 'crown' separate from the 'oil,' *ἁγιον ἐλαιον το χριστον του θεου the holy oil, the chrism (or anointing) of his God.* Adam Clarke very well remarks upon this, 'By his *office* the (high) priest represented Christ in his *sacrificial* character; by his *anointing*, the *prophetic* influence; and by the *crown* the *regal dignity* of our Lord.'

13. *He shall take a wife in her virginity.* Heb. בבתוליה *bibthulëhâ in her virginity*, a term derived from בתל *bâthal, to separate, set apart, seclude*; and applied to a virgin from her being *separated* and *secluded* from intercourse with men, which is eminently the case in the East. Compare this and the following verse with verse 7, where the prohibited marriages of common priests are mentioned. The difference is, that widows are mentioned among those whom the high priest might not marry, but not among those with whom the common priest is forbidden to contract alliance. It would therefore seem that the common priest was allowed to marry a widow, as Josephus declares. Grotius and others, however, think that a priest could not marry any widow, but one whose deceased husband had also been a priest. This is inferred from Ezek. 44. 22. The high priest, being precluded from marrying a widow, was of course exempt from marrying the widow of a brother who died without children. The Mohammedans have no regulations on this subject, being, in fact, without any distinct priestly order. But in India it is not lawful for the priests to marry any but virgins. As the high priest was a type of Christ, his wife, who was to be a virgin, was a type of the church; wherefore the apostle says, 2 Cor. 11. 2, 'I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you a *chaste virgin* to Christ.'

15. *Neither shall he profane his seed among the people.* That is, he shall not render his sons unfit for the priesthood by marrying contrary to the rules above laid down, vv. 13, 14.——¶ *For I the Lord do sanctify him.* That is, have separated him to my service.

Rules in regard to personal Blemishes.

17. *Whosoever he be of thy seed in their generations.* That is, of thy sons in any generation of thy posterity. The address is made to Aaron, and by the sons of Aaron is always to be understood his successors in the priestly of-

18 For whatsoever man *he be* that hath a blemish, he shall not approach: a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose, or any thing [s] superfluous.

19 Or a man that is broken-footed, or broken-handed.

20 Or crook-backed, or a dwarf, or that hath a blemish in his eye, or be scurvy, or scabbed, or [t] hath his stones broken;

21 No man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the priest shall come nigh to [u] offer the offerings of the LORD made by fire; he hath a blemish, he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God.

22 He shall eat the bread of his

[s] ch. 22. 23. [t] Deut. 23. 1. [u] ver. 6.

God, *both* of the [x] most holy, and of the [y] holy.

23 Only he shall not go in unto the vail, nor come nigh unto the altar, because he hath a blemish; that [z] he profane not my sanctuaries: for I the LORD do sanctify them.

24 And Moses told *it* unto Aaron, and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel.

CHAPTER XXII.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto Aaron and to his

[x] ch. 2. 3, 10, and 6. 17, 29, and 7. 1, and 24. 9. Numb. 18. 9. [y] ch. 22. 10, 11, 12. Numb. 18. 19. [z] ver. 12.

fice. The directions therefore concerned the priests. It is made a standing law that no man whose person was any way disfigured by a blemish should minister at the altar. No individual of Aaron's line who was marked by prominent blemishes, defects, or superfluities; by unseemly or ill-favored features; by deformity in any part of his body, whether natural or accidental; or had any permanent distemper upon him, as scurvy itch, scurf, scab, &c., was admitted to the exercise of the priestly prerogative. This requirement is undoubtedly founded upon a just view of human nature, as men are prone to judge by the outward appearance, and to think meanly of any service, however honorable, which is performed by agents distinguished by personal defects. It was greatly for the credit of the sanctuary, therefore, that none should appear there, who were any way disfigured by nature or by accident, as it would be regarded as an indignity to the Deity to consecrate a blemished or imperfect man to his service. But whatever considerations of a subordinate nature may be urged for this statute, the grand reason is undoubtedly to be found in the fact, that the priests, both in their persons and their work, were types of Him who was the 'Lamb without blemish and without spot,' holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. As the particular defects mentioned are sufficiently plain to preclude the necessity of comment, we barely remark, that although these defects disqualified the priests for the sacred functions, they did not exclude them from their prescribed maintenance, as is evident from v. 22, 'He shall eat the bread of his God, both of the most holy and the holy.'

CHAPTER XXII.

Further Directions respecting the Ministrations of the Priests.

The same general subject is continued in the present chapter as in the preceding, viz. the specification of the various causes which were to operate as impediments in the way of the priests' discharging their appropriate functions. Of these the principal were the ceremonial uncleanness to which they might be subject. In the subsequent part of the chapter the scope of the lawgiver is to teach, that the sacrifices, as well as the offerers must be free from blemish, in order to be acceptable.

sons, that they [a] separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel, and that they [b] profane not my holy name *in those things* which they [c] hallow unto me: I *am* the LORD.

3 Say unto them, Whosoever *he be* of all your seed among your generations, that goeth unto the holy things, which the children of Israel hallow unto the LORD, [d] having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off from my presence: I *am* the LORD.

4 What man soever of the seed of Aaron *is* a leper, or hath [e] a running issue; he shall not eat of the holy things, [f] until he be clean.

[a] Numb. 6. 3. [b] ch. 18. 21. [c] Exod. 28. 38. Numb. 18. 32. Deut. 15. 19. [d] ch. 7. 20. [e] ch. 15. 2.

And [g] whoso toucheth any thing *that is* unclean *by* the dead, or [h] a man whose seed goeth from him;

5 Or [i] whosoever toucheth any creeping thing, whereby he may be made unclean, or [k] a man of whom he may take uncleanness, whatsoever uncleanness he hath:

6 The soul which hath touched any such shall be unclean until even, and shall not eat of the holy things, unless he [l] wash his flesh with water.

7 And when the sun is down, he shall be clean, and shall afterward eat of the holy things, because [m] it *is* his food.

[f] ch. 14. 2, and 15. 13. [g] Numb. 19. 11, 22. [h] ch. 15. 16. [i] ch. 11. 24, 43, 44. [k] ch. 15. 7, 19. [l] ch. 15. 5. Heb. 10. 22. [m] ch. 21. 22. Numb. 18. 11, 13.

---

2. *Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, that they separate themselves from the holy things*, &c. Heb. ינזרו *yinnazeru, that they be separated.* The root of the verb is נזר *nâzar, to separate*, from which comes 'Nazarite,' *one religiously separated* from all secular relations. Gr. προσεχετωσαν απο των ἁγιων, *let them take heed of the holy things.* The precept has respect to such of the priests as were ceremonially unclean. During the time that this uncleanness was upon them they were to abstain from eating the holy things which ordinarily belonged to the priests.——¶ *That they profane not my holy name.* Heb. שם קדשי *shem kodshi, the name of my holiness.* But the equivalent rendering of our version is confirmed by the Gr. το ονομα το ἁγιον μου, *my holy name.* The sanctuary would of course be profaned when its holy things were defiled, which they would be when offered or eaten by persons unclean, contrary to the express commandment of God. Compare vv. 15, 32.

3. *Among your generations.* That is, either now or at any time hereafter. ——¶ *That goeth unto the holy things.* That is, for the purpose of eating, as is to be inferred from vv. 4, 6, 12.—— ¶ *Shall be cut off from my presence.* Heb. מלפני *mippenë, from my face or presence;* with a latent allusion to the visible signal of the divine presence in the Shekinah of the tabernacle. The offender would be cut off before that, as were Nadab and Abihu.

4. *Unclean by the dead.* Heb. טמא נפש *temë nephesh, unclean (by) a soul.* Gr. ψυχη, *soul.* For parallel usage see on Lev. 19. 28, and 21. 1, and of the nature of the uncleanness see Numb. 19. 11, 14, 22. The uncleannesses adverted to in the next chapter are such as were contracted by leprosy, running of the reins, involuntary seed-flux; touching the carcase of any forbidden creature; eating of any animal that died of itself, or was torn to pieces by a ravenous beast or bird; or by coming in contact with any person who was at the time legally unclean; with similar instances, which have been considered in the previous chapters.

6–9. *Shall be unclean until even*, &c. The priest thus rendered unclean was to remain like other Israelites, in a

8 [n] That which dieth of itself, or is torn *with beasts*, he shall not eat to defile himself therewith: I *am* the LORD.

9 They shall therefore keep mine ordinance, [o] lest they bear sin for it, and die therefore, if they profane it: I the LORD do sanctify them.

10 [p] There shall no stranger eat *of* the holy thing: a sojourner of the priest, or an hired servant, shall not eat *of* the holy thing.

[n] Exod. 22. 31, ch. 17. 15. Ezek. 44. 31. [o] Exod. 28. 43. Numb. 18. 22. 32. [p] See 1 Sam. 21. 6.

11 But if the priest buy *any* soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he that is born in his house: [q] they shall eat of his meat.

12 If the priest's daughter also be *married* unto a stranger, she may not eat of an offering of the holy things.

13 But if the priest's daughter be a widow, or divorced, and have no child, and is [r] returned unto her father's house, [s] as in her youth, she

[q] Numb. 18. 11, 13. [r] Gen. 38. 11. [s] ch. 10. 14. Numb. 18. 11, 19.

state of separation for a day, i. e. till sunset, and be incapable of all priestly offices and privileges till he had washed his clothes and his body, and this under the penalty of 'bearing sin,' or suffering condign punishment by being cut off by the immediate hand of God, as a bold profaner of his service.

Strangers, Sojourners, and Hired Servants interdicted from eating the Holy Things.

10. *There shall no stranger eat of the holy thing.* That is, not one of another nation, a foreigner, but one that is not of the seed of Aaron, of the family of some priest, is not to be maintained by him out of his share of the sacrifices. ——¶ *Sojourner.* Heb. תושב *toshĕb*, from ישב *yâshab*, *to dwell.* Gr. παροικος, *a stranger-resident.* By a 'sojourner of the priest' is to be understood one that should be a boarder or lodger with him, a transient inmate of his house. Such an one was not to eat of the consecrated things, but was to live upon what accrued to the priest from his common tithes. So also with the hired servant.

11. *If the priest buy any soul with his money.* Heb. כי יקנה נפש קנין כספו *ki yikneh nephesh kinyan kispho, when he shall buy a soul the purchase of his money.* It is evident from this that there were among the ancient Hebrews persons who were bought with money. At the same time it by no means follows, that the slavery which existed among them was of a nature similar to that which is unhappily established among us, or which can be justly pleaded as a precedent to warrant it. Those who were thus 'purchased,' and held in this servile relation, were generally those of their own nation, who from being reduced to a state of poverty, had *sold their own services*, or those whose services had become forfeited by a breach of the laws, or lastly, those who were obtained from the surrounding heathen in the manner which will be considered in the Notes on Lev. 25. It is certain, however, that from whatever source they were obtained, they were treated like the rest of the family to which they belonged, and had privileges entirely unknown to modern servitude. See Note on Gen. 15. 3.——¶ *He that is born in his house.* The children of his slave.

12, 13. *If a priest's daughter be married to a stranger.* That is, to one who was not of the stock or family of the priests, in relation to whom other Israelites were counted as 'strangers.' By marrying out of the priestly line she of course lost the right which she had to her share of the Levitical maintenance while she remained at home in her father's house. An exception to this rule is stated in the next verse,

shall eat of her father's meat; but there shall no stranger eat thereof.

14 ¶ [t] And if a man eat *of* the holy thing unwittingly, then he shall put the fifth *part* thereof unto it, and shall give *it* unto the priest, with the holy thing.

15 And [u] they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel which they offer unto the LORD:

16 Or suffer them [x] to bear the iniquity of trespass, when they eat their holy things: for I the LORD do sanctify them.

17 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

18 Speak unto Aaron, and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them, [y] Whatsoever *he be* of the house of Israel, or of the strangers in Israel, that will offer his oblation for all his vows, and for all his free-will-offerings, which they will offer unto the LORD for a burnt-offering:

[t] ch. 5. 15, 16. [u] Numb. 18. 32. [x] ver. 9. [y] ch. 1. 2, 3, 10. Numb. 15. 14.

when a priest's daughter so married was left a widow, or had been divorced, without children. In this case, she was permitted to return and become a member of her father's family as before, and ate of his food, like the rest of his family.

The case of one who ate of the Holy Things unwittingly.

14. *If a man eat of the holy thing unwittingly.* Heb. בשגגה *bishgâgâh, through unadvised error.* Though the act were done ignorantly and unintentionally, yet in order to inspire the utmost caution in respect to holy things, the priest was to affix a value to the thing eaten, which the offender was obliged to pay, together with a fifth part of the value in addition; all which went to the priest.

15, 16. *They shall not profane,* &c. That is, the priests should not profane the holy things by suffering them to be eaten by strangers. The phrase in the next verse, 'suffer them to bear the iniquity,' may be rendered 'cause them to bear,' meaning that they shall not by their negligence cause the people to fall under the punishment which God would inflict for such a trespass. Otherwise it may be understood of the priests themselves, which appears to be intimated by the marginal reading, 'lade themselves with the iniquity of trespass in their eating.' This is favored by the Gr. which has επαξουσι εφ' ἑαυτους ανομιαν, *bring upon them iniquity.* But after all it is scarcely possible to determine whether the priests or the people are intended.

Free-will and Thank-offerings for Vows to be without Blemish.

18. *Speak unto Aaron, and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel.* As the enactments that follow had respect to the quality of the sacrifices which were to be offered by the congregation, the congregation had, of course, as much concern in them as the priests, and therefore they are addressed to the whole people collectively. They constitute a strict injunction that all sacrifices by way of present, or free-will offering to God, made either by Israelite or proselyte, for thanksgiving for former mercies, or by way of vow for procuring blessings desired, should be perfect in their kind. No beast that was marked by any apparent defect, superfluity, excrescence, deformity, or disease, was permitted to come upon the altar. For the reason of this statute, see Note on Lev. 1., prefatory remarks.——¶ *Or of the strangers in Israel.* Heb. מן הגר *min haggĕr, from the stranger,* collect. sing. Gr. των προσηλυτων των προσκειμενων προς αυτους εν Ισραηλ, *of the proselytes joined unto them in Israel;* i. e. such of the surrounding heathen nations as had renounced idolatry and be-

19 [z] *Ye shall offer* at your own will a male without blemish of the beeves, of the sheep, or of the goats.

20 [a] *But* whatsoever hath a blemish, *that* shall ye not offer: for it shall not be acceptable for you.

21 And [b] whosoever offereth a sacrifice of peace-offerings unto the LORD [c] to accomplish *his* vow, or a free-will-offering in beeves, or sheep, it shall be perfect to be accepted: there shall be no blemish therein.

22 [d] Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen, or scurvy, or scabbed, ye shall not offer these unto the LORD, nor make [e] an offering by fire of them upon the altar unto the LORD.

23 Either a bullock, or a lamb that hath any thing [f] superfluous or lacking in his parts, that mayest thou offer *for* a free-will-offering; but for a vow it shall not be accepted.

24 Ye shall not offer unto the LORD that which is bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut; neither shall ye make *any offering thereof* in your land.

25 Neither [g] from a stranger's hand shall ye offer [h] the bread of

[z] ch. 1. 3. [a] Deut. 15. 21, and 17. 1. Mal. 1. 8, 14. Eph. 5. 27. Heb. 9, 14. 1 Pet. 1. 19. [b] ch. 3. 1, 6. [c] ch. 7. 16. Numb. 15. 3, 8. Deut. 23. 21, 23. Ps. 61. 8, and 65. 1. Eccles. 5. 4, 5. [d] ver. 20. Mal. 1. 8.

[e] ch. 1, 9, 13, and 3. 3, 5. [f] ch. 21. 18. [g] Numb. 15. 15, 16. [h] ch. 21. 6, 17.

---

come converts to the faith of Israel, but had not been circumcised. These were usually called *proselytes of the gate*, and differed entirely from the strangers alluded to, v. 25, as will be seen by the Note in loc.

19. *At your own will.* Rather, according to the Heb. 'for your favorable acceptance.' See Note on Lev. 1. 3. Gr. δεκτα, *acceptable.* Thus too, Sol. Jarchi, 'Bring the thing that is meet to make you acceptable before me, that it may be to your favorable acceptation.' So in the next verse, the leading word in the clause, 'it shall not be acceptable for you.' is in the original precisely the same (רצון *râtzon*).

23. *That hath any thing superfluous or lacking.* That is, deformed by any peculiar elongation or contraction of its limbs.——¶ *That mayest thou offer for a free-will offering.* The most obvious construction of this passage is, that the two kinds of defect just mentioned, though they prevented the acceptance of an animal for a vow, did not for a free-will offering, which would seem to have been considered of less value. But the Hebrew writers understand by free-will offering, in this case, not an offering for sacrifice on the altar, where a blemished beast under no circumstances was allowed, but for the maintenance of the priests, or for sacred uses in general; as, for instance, to be sold for the reparation of the temple, &c.

24. *Ye shall not offer unto the Lord that which is bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut.* That is, castrated; of which there were four modes, expressed by these four terms.——¶ *Neither shall ye make* any offering thereof *in your land.* Heb. בארצכם לא תעשו *beartzekem lo taasu, in your land ye shall not make or do (it).* That is, as the Hebrews understand it, ye shall not do this thing, ye shall not be in the practice of castrating your animals in any part of your land. Otherwise it may be understood as in our version, which is sustained by the Greek. See Note on Deut. 23. 1.

25. *Neither from a stranger's hand shall ye offer.* Heb. מיד בן נכר *miyad bĕn nâkâr, from the hand of the son of an alien.* That is, a Gentile, a foreigner, one not of the seed of Israel. Gr. αλλογενης, *of another stock.* The Hebrew writers for the most part expound this of blemished beasts, brought by Gentiles to be offered to the Lord, which was sometimes the case with

your God of any of these; because their [i] corruption *is* in them, *and* blemishes *be* in them: they shall not be accepted for you.

26 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

27 [k] When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

28 And *whether it be* cow, or ewe, ye shall not kill it [l] and her young both in one day.

[i] Mal. 1. 14. [k] Exod. 22. 30. [l] Deut. 22. 6.

29 And when ye will [m] offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving unto the LORD, offer *it* at your own will.

30 On the same day it shall be eaten up, ye shall leave [n] none of it until the morrow: I *am* the LORD.

31 [o] Therefore shall ye keep my commandments, and do them: I *am* the LORD.

32 [p] Neither shall ye profane my holy name; but [q] I will be hallowed among the children of Israel: I *am* the LORD which [r] hallow you,

[m] ch. 7. 12. Ps. 107. 22, and 116. 17. Amos 4. 5. [n] ch. 7. 15. [o] ch. 19. 37. Numb. 15. 40. Deut. 4. 40. [p] ch. 18. 21. [q] ch. 10. 3. Matt. 6. 9. Luke 11. 2. [r] ch. 20. 8.

those who were convinced of the folly of idolatry, and felt the prompting of a better service towards God. This is recognized by Maimonides: 'If the heathen (Gentile) bringeth peace-offerings, he offereth them for burnt-offerings, for the heathen's heart is towards heaven;' they are often prompted to worship. We see something of this kind in the case of Cyrus, Ezra 6. 8–10. But though their sacrifices were allowed, yet the victims were required to be no less perfect than those of the Israelites. As *they* were to bring no blemished offering, so they were to take none such from the hand of a stranger. Such offerers were obliged to adhere to the rites of the country observed by the priests. Thus Alexander the Great, when he was at Jerusalem, offered sacrifice to God according to the directions of the high priest. Josephus, Lib. 11., at the end.——¶ *Because their corruption is in them.* That is, their faults are in them, the faults above mentioned; which might as a general rule be presumed, coming from the source they did. It would be natural that the ideas of the heathen on these matters would be very loose.

The Age at which different Animals were to be offered to God.

27. *It shall be seven days under the dam.* Before the eighth day they were not fit for food, and therefore not for sacrifice, which was the bread or food of God, as it is frequently termed. See Note on Ex. 22. 30.

28. *Ye shall not kill it and her young both in one day.* This precept seems to be confined to sacrifices, which were to be devoid of all appearance of cruelty. The Jews in general understand it as inculcating mercy. Maimonides expressly remarks, that it was designed to prevent the slaughter of the young 'in the presence of the dam, because this occasions to animals extreme grief; nor is there, in this respect, a difference between the distress of man and that of the irrational creation.' The Targum of Jonathan beautifully introduces the verse with this paraphrase:—'And my people, the children of Israel, as our Father is merciful in heaven, so be ye merciful on earth.'

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE JEWISH FESTIVALS.

The present chapter partakes in great measure of the character of the nineteenth, containing a republication of certain laws. The inspired historian having previously given full details of the statutes relative to holy *persons*, holy *things*, and holy *places*, now enters

33 [s] That brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: I *am* the LORD.

[s] Ex. 6. 7. ch. 11. 45, and 19. 36, and 25. 38. Numb. 15. 41.

upon the consideration of holy *times*. The laws relative to the annual fast, the feast of trumpets, and the three great annual festivals, are here all brought together in one view, in their chronological order, along with the law of the Sabbath; and additions to the ceremonies, as before prescribed, are interspersed. These festivals constituted a very peculiar feature of the Hebrew polity. Their influence, involving as they did the meeting of the mass of the male population in one place three times every year, cannot be too highly estimated. The journey itself, taking place at the finest season of the year, would naturally be deemed rather a recreative excursion than a hardship, in a country so small as that which the Hebrews were destined to occupy. One grand design of these re-unions appears to have been to counteract the dividing tendency of the separation into clans or tribes. By being thus brought into contact on an equal footing, they were reminded of their common origin, and of their common objects. The fact was brought home vividly to their thoughts that they were the sons of the same father, worshippers of the same God, and heirs of the same promises. The beginnings also of idolatry were likely to be checked by the frequent renewal of these acts of worship and homage. Persons of distant towns and different tribes met together on terms of brotherhood and fellowship; and old relations were renewed, and new ones formed.

Several sections are devoted by Michaelis to the statement of the political and other advantages resulting from these festivals. Among other considerations, he observes, that if any of the tribes happened to be jealous of each other, or, as was sometimes the case involved in civil war, still their meeting together in one place for the purposes of religion and sociality, had a tendency to prevent their being completely alienated, and forming themselves into two or more unconnected states; and even though this had at any time happened, it gave them an opportunity of again cementing their differences, and re-uniting. This is so correctly true, that the separation of the ten tribes from the tribe of Judah, under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, could never have been permanent, had not the latter abrogated one part of the Law of Moses relative to festivals.

Another effect of these meetings regarded the internal commerce of the Israelites. From the annual conventions of the whole people of any country for religious purposes, there generally arise, without any direct intention on their part, annual fairs, and internal commerce. Such festivals have always been attended with this effect. The famous old fair near Hebron arose from the congregation of pilgrims to the terebinth-tree of Abraham. The yearly fairs among the Germans had a similar origin. Among the Mohammedans similar festivals have always had the same results. Witness the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, which, in spite of many adverse circumstances, has given birth to one of the greatest markets in the world. Now the very same effects and to a still higher degree, must, even without any intention on the part of the legislator, have resulted from the high festivals of the Hebrews, to which the whole people were bound to assemble; and more particularly as far as regards internal trade. Let us only figure to ourselves what would necessarily follow from such festivals being established. Every man would bring along with him every portable article which he could spare, and which he wished to turn

CHAPTER XXIII.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, *Concerning* [a] the feasts of the LORD, which ye shall [b] proclaim *to be* holy convocations, *even* these *are* my feasts

3 [c] Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day *is* the sabbath of rest, an holy convocation: ye

[a] ver. 4. 37.

[b] Exod. 32. 5. 2 Kings 10. 20. Ps. 81. 3

[c] Exod. 20. 9, and 23. 12, and 31. 15, and 34 21. ch. 19. 3. Deut. 5. 13. Luke 13. 14.

into money; and as several individuals would go from the same place, they would contrive various expedients to render their goods portable; and this would be the more readily suggested by the habit of taking things, some of them needing carriage, to Jerusalem, as dues and offerings. Nor are means of conveyance expensive in the East, as they consist not, as with us, of wagons and horses, but of asses and camels—beasts which are highly serviceable in promoting the internal traffic of Syria and Arabia. There could never be any want of buyers, where the whole people were convened; and the wholesale merchants would soon find it for their advantage to attend, and purchase the commodities offered for sale by private individuals, especially manufactured goods. Whoever wished to purchase any particular articles would await the festivals in order to have a choice; and this, too, would lead great merchants to attend with all manner of goods for sale, for which they could hope to find purchasers. However, therefore, Moses may have desired to discourage the Israelites from engaging in *foreign* commerce, his measures were, in this instance at least, and whether intended or not, highly favorable to the *internal* intercourse and traffic of the country.

For a more extended view of the happy effects, political, social, and economical, of these festivals, see Michaelis' Comment. on Laws of Moses, vol. III § 197–201.

General Introduction.

2. Concerning *the feasts of the Lord.* Heb. מועדי יהוה *moëdë Yehovah*, (*as to*) *the feasts of Jehovah.* The original word מועד *moëd*, from יעד *yâad*, *to fix by appointment*, literally implies merely a *set time*, a *stated season*, for any purpose whatever, but is applied here and often elsewhere to the *solemn feasts* of the Israelites, which were appointed by God, and fixed to certain seasons of the year. It is sometimes rendered in the Gr. by εορτη, *a feast*, and sometimes by πανηγυρις, *a general assembly*, of which the former occurs, Col. 2. 16, 'Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an *holy day* (εορτη), or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days;' and the other Heb. 12. 23, 'But ye are come——to the *general assembly* (πανηγυρις) and church of the first-born.' Perhaps a more suitable rendering of the term would be 'solemnities.'——¶ *Which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations.* The Hebrew may be rendered more literally, 'which ye shall call (as) callings of holiness;' i. e. assemblages of the people which should be convened for holy or sacred purposes at set times by public proclamation, and generally by the sound of a trumpet, Num. 10. 8–10.——¶ *These are my feasts.* Or, my assemblies, appointed in honor of my name, and to be observed in obedience to my command; viz. the sabbath, the passover, pentecost, the beginning of the new year, the day of atonement, and the feast of tabernacles; all which are embraced under the general name מועד *moëd*, and none besides.

The Sabbath.

3. *Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is a sabbath of rest*, &c. Heb. שבת שבתון *shabbath shabbathon*,

shall do no work *therein*, it *is* the sabbath of the LORD in all your dwellings.

4 ¶ [d] These *are* the feasts of the LORD, *even* holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons.

5 [e] In the fourteenth *day* of the first month at even *is* the LORD's passover.

[d] ver. 2. 37. Exod. 23. 14. [e] Exod. 12. 6, 14, 18, and 13. 3, 10, and 23. 15, and 34. 18. Numb. 9. 2, 3, and 28. 16, 17. Deut. 16. 1-8. Josh. 5. 10.

6 And on the fifteenth day of the same month *is* the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread.

7 [f] In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein.

8 But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD seven days; in the seventh day *is* an holy convocation, ye shall do no servile work *therein*.

[f] Exod. 12. 16. Numb. 28. 18. 25.

a sabbath of sabbatism; a highly emphatic phrase denoting the greatest degree of consecration to purposes of rest. Although the main scope of the chapter has relation to other sacred seasons, yet as the Sabbath was ever to be esteemed the grand solemnity, which was never to be supplanted or eclipsed by any other, therefore it is introduced here by way of preface to the others. See Note on Gen. 2. 3.——¶ *An holy convocation.* That is, a *time* of holy convocation; from which it appears that meetings for public worship are an essential part of the due observance of the day, and that they cannot be neglected or omitted without going contrary to one main design of the institution.——¶ *Ye shall do no work therein.* On other holy days they were forbidden to do any *servile* work, v. 7, but on the sabbath, and the day of atonement, (which is also called a subbath,) they were to do *no work at all*, not even the dressing of meat.——¶ *In all your dwellings.* Heb. בכל משובתיכם *bekol meshubothekem, in all your dwelling-places;* by which is meant not so much in their private habitations as in the various places of their residence over the country. Gr. *εν πασῃ κατοικια ὑμων, in all your inhabiting*, i. e. in every place that you may inhabit. The great feasts were to be kept in one place where the sanctuary was established; but the sabbaths in this respect differed from them. They were to be observed all over the land wherever they dwelt, particularly in the synagogues in every city, Acts 15, 21.

1. *The Passover.*

5–8. *On the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's Passover.* Although moons, which began with the new moon, cannot, with perfect accuracy, be accommodated to our months, the first month of the Hebrew year must always have fallen within the month of April.

The Passover, it is well known, was kept in remembrance of the exodus from Egypt. The etymology of the term, and the occasion and circumstances of the institution have already been dwelt upon in our Notes on Ex. 12. We shall consequently be spared the necessity of any thing more than a general sketch of the observance of this feast. On the eve of the 14th day of the month (Abib or Nisan) all leaven was removed from their dwellings, so that nothing might be seen of it during the week; a circumstance respecting which the Jews are very scrupulous even at this day. Previously to the commencement of the feast, on the tenth, the master of a family set apart a ram or a goat of a year old, usually the former, which he slew on the fourteenth, 'between the two evenings,' before the altar; but in Egypt, where the event occurred which the Passover celebrated, the blood was sprinkled on the post

9 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,
10 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, ε When

ε Exod. 23. 16. 19, and 34. 22, 26. Numb. 15. 2, 18, and 28. 26. Deut. 16. 9. Josh. 3. 15.

of the door. The ram or kid was roasted whole, with two spits thrust through it, the one lengthwise, the other transversely, crossing the longitudinal one near the fore legs, so that the animal was, in a manner, crucified. The oven in which it was roasted was the circular pit in the floor [ground], which is still commonly used in the East. The restriction that it was to be roasted, *not boiled or eaten raw*, is thought to be levelled at some idolatrous forms of sacrifice-feasting. Thus roasted, the Paschal Lamb was served up with a salad of wild and bitter herbs, and with the flesh of other sacrifices (peace-offerings), which are mentioned in Deut. 16. 2–6. Not fewer than ten, nor more than twenty persons were admitted to these sacred feasts, which were, at first, eaten in Egypt with loins girt about, with sandals on the feet, and with all the preparations for an immediate journey. But this does not appear to have been the case at any subsequent period. The command, however, not to break a bone of the offering, which was given in consequence of the people going in such haste (as they might otherwise have been delayed), was ever after observed among the Jews. In later times the celebration became encumbered with a number of involved ceremonies, very different from the simplicity and haste of the original institution. As these derive no authority from the law, we shall only state such of them as serve to illustrate the account of that celebration of the Passover by Jesus Christ, which to the Christian is not less interesting than the original institution was to the Jew. The master of the family, after the Paschal supper was prepared, broke the bread, having first blessed it, and distributed it to all who were seated around him, so that each one might receive a part; and each was at liberty to dip it, before eating, into a vessel of sauce. There were four cups of wine ordinarily drank at this supper, two before and two after meat. With the second, the two first hymns of what was called the lesser *Hallel*, being Psalms 113. and 114., were sung or chanted. The third cup, being the first after supper, was called the cup of blessing, because over it they blessed God, or said grace after meat. This was followed by a fourth and last cup, over which they completed the hymn of praise, formed by the remainder of the *lesser Hallel*, and thus the feast concluded. But it is said that a fifth cup of wine might be drunk by those who wished to repeat the great Hallel, which is generally understood to be Psalm 136. The wine was red, mixed with water.

The Passover was immediately followed by the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which lasted seven days, so that the two together seemed to make one feast of eight days, and were, in fact, popularly so considered, the names being often interchanged, so that the Passover day was sometimes considered as the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, and, on the other hand, the whole was often called the Passover Feast. The first and last days of these seven were to be kept as Sabbaths, save that only *servile* labor was interdicted, which allowed food to be cooked. But no suspension of labor was *required* on the intermediate five days, which were distinguished chiefly by the abstinence from leavened bread, and by the unusual number of offerings at the tabernacle or temple, and of sacrifices for sin. The sixteenth of Abib, or the second day of Unleavened Bread, was distinguished by the offering of a barley sheaf, as an introduction to the barley-harvest which was ripe about this time, accom

ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of [h] the first-fruits of your harvest unto the priest:

11 And he shall [i] wave the sheaf before the LORD, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it.

12 And ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf, an he-lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt-offering unto the LORD.

13 [k] And the meat-offering thereof *shall be* two tenth-deals of fine flour mingled with oil, an offering made by fire unto the LORD *for* a sweet savour: and the drink-offering thereof *shall be* of wine, the fourth *part* of an hin.

14 And ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, until the self-same day that ye have brought an offering unto your God: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings.

15 ¶ And [l] ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering; seven sabbaths shall be complete:

[h] Rom. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 15. 20. Jam. 1. 18. Rev. 14. 4. [i] Exod. 29. 24. [k] ch. 2. 14-16.

[l] ch. 25. 8. Exod. 34. 22. Deut, 16. 9.

panied by a particular sacrifice, described in v. 9-14.

The Sheaf of First Fruits.

10. *When ye be come into the land*, &c. The actual observance of this law was to be deferred till they had arrived in the land of Canaan, and had become permanently fixed in their settlements; for during their sojourn in the wilderness they could neither sow nor reap. ——¶ *Ye shall bring a sheaf of the first fruits.* A sheaf of the new corn was brought to the priest who was to heave it up, in token of his presenting it to the God of heaven, and to wave it to and fro before the Lord, as the Lord of the whole earth, and the bountiful giver of all its fruits and favors. This offering of the sheaf of the first fruits did as it were sanctify to him all the rest of the harvest. Besides, it served as a type of Christ, who, as risen from the dead, is the 'first fruits of them that slept.' 1 Cor. 15. 20.

14. *Ye shall eat neither bread*, &c. This is a precept which would naturally commend itself to the better feelings of every pious and reflecting mind. Nothing could be more appropriate than thus to testify a grateful sense of the source from whence the crowning blessings of life proceeded. As God was the bountiful donor of the blessings of the harvest, it was an ordinance which would find a response in every right heart, that he should first be honored with its fruits before his creatures should have appropriated any part of them to their own use. This universal dictate of a grateful bosom found a fitting expression in the customs of the ancient Romans, of whom Pliny says, 'Ne gustabant quidem novas fruges, aut vina, antequam sacerdotes primitias libassent,' *they did not so much as taste of their corn or wine, till the priests had offered the first fruits.*

2. Feast of Pentecost.

15. *Ye shall count unto you*, &c. From the day of waving the sheaf they were to count seven sabbaths or weeks complete, or forty-nine days, and then was to be celebrated the second or great harvest-festival, called *Pentecost*, from the Gr. πεντηκοστη, *fifty*, from its beginning *fifty days* after the waving of the sheaf of the first fruits.

The Feast of Pentecost, here instituted, is called by various names in the sacred writings, as 'the feast of weeks,'

16 Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number [m] fifty days; and ye shall offer [n] a new meat-offering unto the LORD.

17 Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave-loaves of two tenth-deals: they shall be of fine flour, they shall be baken with leaven, *they are* [o] the first-fruits unto the LORD.

18 And ye shall offer with the bread seven lambs without blemish of the first year, and one young bullock, and two rams: they shall be *for* a burnt-offering unto the LORD, with their meat-offering, and their drink-offerings, *even* an offering made by fire of sweet savour unto the LORD.

19 Then ye shall sacrifice [p] one kid of the goats for a sin-offering, and two lambs of the first year for a sacrifice of [q] peace-offerings.

20 And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the first-fruits *for* a wave-offering before the LORD, with the two lambs: [r] they shall be holy to the LORD for the priest.

21 And ye shall proclaim on the self-same day, *that* it may be an holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work *therein: it shall be* a statute for ever in all

[m] Acts 2. 1. [n] Numb. 28. 26. [o] Exod. 23. 16, 19, and 22. 29, and 34. 22, 26. Numb. 15. 17, and 28. 26. Deut. 26. 1.

[p] ch. 4. 23, 28. Numb. 28. 30. [q] ch. 3. 1. [r] Numb. 18. 12. Deut. 18. 4.

Ex. 34. 22; Deut. 16. 10, 16, because of its being celebrated a week of weeks, or seven-weeks, after the feast of unleavened bread; the 'feast of harvest,' Ex. 23. 16; and also the 'day of first fruits,' Num. 16. 26; for this was properly the harvest-festival at which the Israelites were to offer thanksgivings to God for the bounties of the harvest, and to present to him the first fruits thereof in bread baked of the new corn. It seems, in fact, that the barley harvest commenced about the Passover, and the wheat harvest ended at the Pentecost in Palestine, where, as in Egypt, the barley is ripe considerably earlier than the wheat. This festival lasted for seven days, during which many holocausts and offerings for sin were sacrificed. In later times many Jews from foreign countries came to Jerusalem on this joyful occasion. Even at that time, and still more since then, a greater degree of relative importance seems to have been attached to this festival than appears to have been designed by the law. It was discovered that the date, fifty days after the Passover, coincided with the delivery of the law from Mount Sinai, which was fifty days after the departure from Egypt, and consequently after the first Passover. Hence, by degrees, instead of resting on the ground on which Moses placed it, the festival was turned into a commemoration of that great event.

17. *Ye shall bring out of your habitations.* That is, not out of their houses, but out of some one or more of the several places or regions where they abode, as explained above, in the Note on v. 3. It cannot be supposed to mean that each locality where Israelites resided furnished two wave loaves, for there were to be but two for the whole nation; but the leading idea is, that the flour was to be supplied from some place in the country, and was then offered in the name of the whole congregation, together with the seven lambs, the young bullock, the two rams, the kid, and the two lambs; all which were no doubt furnished at the common charges of the whole people. As the loaves were not to be *burnt* on the altar, they were allowed to be made of leaven, without contradicting ch. 2. 11, 12.

21. *Ye shall do no servile work therein.* This the Jews understood of every

your dwellings throughout your generations.

22 ¶ And [s] when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, [t] neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I *am* the LORD your God.

23 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

24 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, In the [u] seventh month in the first *day* of the month, shall ye have a sabbath, [x] a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation.

[s] ch. 19. 9. [t] Deut. 24. 19.

[u] Numb. 29. 1. [x] ch. 25. 9.

---

kind of labor except that which pertained to the preparation of food. It properly denotes that more laborious kind of service which we understand by *drudgery*, such as ploughing, sowing, reaping, threshing, gathering the vintage, &c.

22. *When ye reap the harvest*, &c. See Note on Lev. 19. 9. Comp. Deut. 24. 19.

3. *The Feast of Trumpets.*

24. *A memorial of blowing of trumpets.* Heb. זכרון תרועה *zikron teruâh*, which the Chal. renders *a memorial of shouting.* As the word in the original for *memorial* has the sense of *celebrating* or *commemorating with praise*, the import of the language undoubtedly is, 'A festival for *commemorating* or *praising* God with the sound of trumpets.' It was observed with great solemnity, the trumpets sounding from sun-rise to sun-set. The priest who sounded the first trumpet, began with the usual prayer, 'Blessed be God who hath sanctified us by his precepts,' &c., subjoining, 'Blessed be God who hath hitherto preserved us in life, and brought us unto this time.' After this the people repeated with a loud voice the following words from Ps. 88. 15: 'Blessed is the people who know the joyful sound,' &c. As the feast of new moons was the sanctifying of each month, so the feast of trumpets was the sanctifying of each year, and a reminding of the Israelites that all their times were in God's hand. How rational and dignified was this conduct throughout the land of Judea, when compared with the general practice of other nations! For, instead of making the new year a day of devotion, it is commonly a day of idleness and dissipation. At the present day, as we are told by Calmet, Leo of Modena, Buxtorf, and Basnage, the Jews are accustomed on this evening to wish one another a good year, to make better cheer than ordinary, and to sound the trumpet thirty times successively. During this feast, which lasts, it seems, the first two days of the year, business is suspended, and they hold, by tradition, that on this day God particularly judges the actions of the foregoing year, and disposes the events of the year following. Wherefore, on the first days of the foregoing month, or eight days at least before the feast of trumpets, they generally apply themselves to works of penitence, and the evening before the feast many of them receive 39 lashes by way of discipline. On the first evening of the year, and which precedes the first day of Tizri (for their evening precedes their morning,) as they return from the synagogue they say to one another, 'May you be written in a good year;' to which the other answers, 'And you also.' On their return home, they serve up at table honey and unleavened bread, and whatever may signify a plentiful and happy year. Some of them, on the morning of these two feasts, go to the synagogue clothed in white, in token of purity and penitence. Among the G.r-

25 Ye shall do no servile work *therein;* but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

26 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

27 y Also on the tenth *day* of this seventh month *there shall be* a day of atonement; it shall be an holy convocation unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

28 And ye shall do no work in that same day; for it *is* a day of atonement to make an atonement for you before the LORD your God.

29 For whatsoever soul *it be* that shall not be afflicted in that same

y ch. 16. 30. Numb. 29. 7.

man Jews, some wear the habit which they have appointed for their burial, and this is done as a mortification.

On this day they repeat in the synagogues several appropriate prayers and benedictions. They take the Pentateuch very solemnly from its chest, and call upon five persons to read the portion which describes the sacrifice that was appointed for that day; then they twenty times sound a horn, sometimes very slowly, and at other times quickly, to remind them, as they explain it, of the judgments of God, to intimidate sinners, and induce them to repent. After prayers they return to their houses, to take some refreshment, and spend the rest of the day in hearing sermons, and in other exercises of devotion. The two days of the feast being observed exactly in the same manner, a more particular description of the latter would be unnecessary. It may, however, be remarked, with respect to their preparation for the feast, that many of the Jews plunge themselves in cold water, confessing, as they descend into it, their numerous sins, and beating their breasts; and they plunge themselves over the head, that they may appear entirely clean before God, for they think that, on this day, God assembles his council, or his angels, and that he opens his book to judge all men. Three sorts of books, they imagine, are opened; viz. the book of life for the just; the book of death for the wicked; and the book of a middle state, for such as are neither very good nor very bad. In the two books of life and death they conceive there are two kinds of pages, one for this life, and the other for the next; for it often happens that the wicked are not punished in this life according to their demerits, whereas the just suffer severely, as if they had incurred the displeasure of God. This conduct of the Almighty is the reason why no one can be sure of his state, but is uncertain whether he be worthy to be loved or hated. With respect to the middle class, they think that they are not written down any where, for God delays it till the day of annual expiation, which is the tenth day after, to see if they will reform; and then their sentence is fixed either for life or death. Such are the ceremonies with which the modern Jews are said to observe the feast of trumpets; but it should ever be recollected, that these ceremonies are far from being universal; for in countries where superstition prevails, they insensibly become tinctured with it, and in countries where a more rational mode of thinking is general, they as naturally adopt a more rational ritual.

4. *The Day of Atonement.*

27–32. *On the tenth* day *of this seventh month*, there shall be *a day of atonement*. This was properly an annual *fast*, and the only one prescribed by the law, however fasts may abound in the present calendar of the Jews. It occurred on the fifth day before the Feast of Tabernacles, or on the tenth of the seventh month, Tisri (October). On this day they were to abstain from all servile work, to take no food 'from evening to evening,' during which they

day, [z] he shall be cut off from among his people.

30 And whatsoever soul *it be* that doeth any work in that same day, [a] the same soul will I destroy from among his people.

31 Ye shall do no manner of work: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings.

32 It *shall be* unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth *day* of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath.

33 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

34 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, [b] The fifteenth day of this seventh month *shall be* the feast of tabernacles *for* seven days unto the LORD.

[z] Gen. 17. 14. [a] ch. 20. 3, 5, 6.

[b] Exod. 23. 16. Numb. 29. 12. Deut. 16. 13. Ezra 3. 4. Neh. 8. 14. Zech. 14. 16. John 7. 2.

were to 'afflict their souls.' The sacrificial services of this day were the most solemn in all the year, but as we have more fully considered the details of the festival in our Notes on the 16th chapter, it will be unnecessary to repeat them here.

5. *The Feast of Tabernacles.*

34. *The fifteenth day of the seventh month shall be the feast of tabernacles.* This festival is termed in Hebrew חג הסכות *'hag hassukoth*, *feast of tents, or booths*, but by the Chal. is called 'the shade of clouds,' in allusion to the shadow of the divine protection in the pillar of cloud that attended the Israelites in their journey through the wilderness.

The Feast of Tabernacles was instituted in memory of the journey through the Arabian wilderness, and therefore the people, during its continuance, dwelt in booths. This lasted seven days, from the 15th to the 22d of the seventh month, Tisri (October). It is usual to state that another object of this feast was as a Feast of In-gathering, to return thanks, and to rejoice for the completed vintage and gathering in of the fruits. But a close examination will make it probable that this was the separate object of the eighth day, which was added to the seven: for it was only during the seven days that the people were to dwell in booths. Being thus closely connected, they got to be regarded as one festival, and the names were confounded and interchanged, as in the analogous case of the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread. Instead, therefore, of regarding this as one festival of eight days, with two names and two objects, it seems best to regard it as a union of two festivals with different names and objects, the one of seven days, and the other of one day.

As in the other festivals of a week's duration, the first and last days were to be observed as Sabbaths, with the exception that only *servile* labor was interdicted. On the other five days any kind of work might be executed. During all the seven the people were to live in booths made of branches of several sorts of trees, which, as mentioned in Lev. 23. 40, are the palm, the willow, and two others, which seem to denote 'beautiful trees,' and any 'thick or bushy wood,' rather than any particular species. Those named in Nehem. 8. 15, are different, and it seems reasonable to conclude that it was not the intention of the law to compel the use of any particular species, but only such as were suitable for the purpose and could be easily procured. It is not expressly said in the law that the booths were to be made with those branches, though the language of the text with the context, obviously leads to that conclusion. It was so understood in the time of Nehemiah. But the Sadducees and Pharisees, in later days, split on

35 On the first day *shall be* a holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work *therein.*

36 Seven days ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD; [c] on the eighth day shall be a holy convocation unto you, and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD: it *is* a [d] solemn assembly; *and* ye shall do no servile work *therein.*

[c] Numb. 29. 35. Neh. 8. 18. John 7. 37.
[d] Deut. 16. 8. 2 Chron. 7. 9. Neh. 8. 18. Joel. 1. 14, and 2. 15.

37 [e] These *are* the feasts of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim *to be* holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt-offering, and a meat-offering, a sacrifice, and drink-offerings, every thing upon his day:

38 [f] Besides the sabbaths of the LORD, and besides your gifts, and besides all your vows, and besides all your free-will-offerings, which ye give unto the LORD.

[e] ver. 2. 4. [f] Numb. 29. 39.

this point; the former understanding that the booths were to be made of the boughs, while the latter contended that they were to be borne rejoicingly in the hands. The latter practice prevailed in the time of Christ, as it does to this day. The Karaites, however, follow the interpretation of the Sadducees, which seems to be the right one, although it must be confessed that the Israelites did not, in the Arabian wilderness dwell in green booths, but in tents. It seems that the people often made their booths on the flat roofs of their houses. More public sacrifies were to be offered on this festival than on any of the others, as may be seen in Num. 29. 12–39. This feast was celebrated with more of outward glee than any others, though without intemperance, to which the Hebrews as a nation, do not appear to have been ever much addicted. The ceremonies of parading in procession with branches, chanting hosannas, and of drawing water from the pool of Siloam, to pour out, mixed with wine, on the sacrifice as it lay on the altar, existed in the time of Christ, and before; but they rest rather upon tradition than upon any express law of Moses. The eighth day, which we regard as the proper *Feast of In-gathering*, was kept as a Sabbath (and sometimes must actually have been one) like the first of the tabernacle feasts. Notwithstanding its being a distinct festival, the sacrifices for it were less than those of any of the preceding seven days.

36. *It is a solemn assembly.* Heb. עצרת הוא *atzereth hi*, rendered in the margin *a day of restraint.* This is a new term, which does not occur previously in reference to any of the feasts here mentioned, and is of somewhat difficult interpretation. As the verbal root עצר *âtzar* signifies *to shut up, to close*, Theodoret renders it το τελος των εορτων, *the conclusion of the feast.* So also the Gr. of the LXX. has εξοδιον, *outgoing*, or *close.* The term is applied to the *last* or *concluding* day of the feast of unleavened bread, Deut. 16. 8, and Josephus remarks, that the feast of Pentecost, which was kept at the *end* of seven computed weeks, was called ασαρθα, *asartha*, evidently from the Heb. original. This, therefore, as it was the *last*, so it was the *great day* of the feast, as it is termed by the Evangelist, John 7. 37. From this it would seem that any great solemnity or assemblage is called by this name of עצרת *atzereth*, as 2 Kings 10. 20, Joel 1. 14; although Gesenius maintains that the noun derives the meaning of *assemblage* from that sense of the root which he renders *to stay, restrain, constrain*; which is equivalent to the explication of the Jewish doctors, who make it as implying *restraint* or *detention*, inasmuch as they were detained at Jerusalem one day longer than on any other festival, none of which lasted more than seven

39 Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have [g] gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the LORD seven days: on the first day *shall be* a sabbath, and on the eighth day *shall be* a sabbath.

[g] Exod. 23. 16. Deut. 16 13.

40 And [h] ye shall take you on the first day the boughs of goodly trees, branches of palm-trees, and the boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook; [i] and ye shall rejoice before the LORD your God seven days.

[h] Neh. 8. 15. [i] Deut. 16. 14, 15.

days. It is one of the cases where the import of the original is unavoidably left doubtful.

39. *Also in the fifteenth day*, &c. There is here no new injunction, but merely a reiteration and enforcement of what was said before. It is simply an amplification of the particulars of the feast of tabernacles. The particle 'also' therefore should be rendered 'surely,' 'truly,' or something equivalent.

40. *Ye shall take you on the first day the boughs of goodly trees.* Heb. פרי עץ הדר *peri ĕtz hâdâr, the fruit of the tree of goodliness, or honor;* implying probably that branches were taken with the fruit as well as the leaves upon them, wherever such could be conveniently obtained. Otherwise common fruitless boughs were doubtless to be made use of. Their booths were a kind of arbors. Maimonides, the oracle of the Jews, following the Jerusalem Targum, contends that the *citron* or *pome-citron*, is the particular tree whose boughs were taken on this occasion; and so firm in this persuasion are even the modern Jews, that they fancy the feast cannot be duly celebrated without such branches. Numbers, therefore, of the German Jews send annually into Spain, to procure a quantity of branches with the citrons upon them; and when the feast is over they distribute them as a gift of great value to their friends. ——¶ *Branches of palm-trees.* These branches, as also the others mentioned in this connexion, the Sadducees understood to be for making their booths, but the Pharisees contend that they were to be carried in their hands; which is the practice of the modern Jews to this day. They tie together one branch of palm, three branches of myrtle, and one of willow. This they carry in their right hands, and in their left they have a branch of citron with its fruit, whenever they can procure it. With these they make a procession in their synagogues every day of the feast, that is, for seven days, around their reading desks, as their ancestors did around the walls of Jericho, in token of the expected downfall of their enemies. While making this procession, they sing 'Hosannah,' whence the feast itself is sometimes called by the Rabbins 'the Hosannah;' and sometimes the branches are called by the same name. On the last great day, which they call 'Hosannah Rabbah,' or 'the great Hosannah,' they make the procession seven times together, in memory of the siege of Jericho. The form of the Hosannah in their ritual, which they sing on this occasion, is remarkable:—

> For thy sake, O our Creator, Hosannah.
> For thy sake, O our Redeemer, Hosannah.
> For thy sake, O our Seeker, Hosannah.

This would seem to be a virtual calling upon the blessed Trinity to *save* them and *send them help*.

Another distinguishing ceremony on this occasion was *the pouring out of water*, the manner of which was as follows:—One of the priests, with a golden flagon, went to the pool of Siloam or Bethesda, where, filling it with water, he returned to the court of the priests by the gate on the south side of the court of Israel, thence called the Water Gate; and no sooner did he appear, than the silver trumpets sounded to

41 [k] And ye shall keep it a feast unto the LORD seven days in the year: *it shall be* a statute for ever in your generations; ye shall celebrate it in the seventh month.

42 [l] Ye shall dwell in booths seven days; all that are Israelites born shall dwell in booths:

[k] Numb. 29 12. Neh. 8. 18. [l] Neh. 8. 14, 15, 16.

43 [m] That your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt: I *am* the LORD your God.

44 And Moses [n] declared unto the children of Israel the feasts of the LORD.

[m] Deut. 31. 13. Ps. 78. 5, 6. [n] ver. 2.

announce his arrival. He continued to advance and went directly to the top of the altar, to the two basons that stood, the one with the wine for the ordinary drink-offering, the other for the water which he had brought; where, pouring the water into the empty bason, he mixed the wine and water together, and afterwards poured out both together by way of libation. There is nothing said about this part of the ceremonies in the law of Moses, but the Jews pretend to find authority for it in Is. 12. 3, 'With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation.' The conjecture of Patrick is far more probable, that it was in memory of the water which followed them during all the time of their sojourning in the wilderness. It is supposed that our Savior alludes to this custom, where it is said, John 7. 37, 38, 'In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' This was a season of so much rejoicing, that it passed into a common proverb, that 'he that never saw the rejoicing of drawing water, never saw rejoicing in his life.'

42. *Ye shall dwell in booths.* Heb. בסכת תשבו *besukkoth tëshebu, ye shall sit (abide) in booths.* These were afterwards, in Jerusalem, constructed on the tops of their houses, in their court-yards, and in the streets. Neh. 8. 16. They were made of the branches of various trees, as before remarked, v. 15, and the Hebrew canons affirm that they were not to be covered with any kind of cloth, or any thing that had not grown out of the earth, or with aught that was faded or withered, or that had an ill savor, or that was in any way unclean. Maimonides observes that this feast was fixed to that season when the people could dwell in booths with the least inconvenience, as the weather was then moderate, and they were not wont to be troubled either with heat or with rain.

CHAPTER XXIV.

In the series of the foregoing chapters we have seen that, after the setting up of the tabernacle, directions were given as to the several kinds of sacrifices that should be offered, and the personal qualifications of those that should offer them. Aaron and his sons having been duly consecrated, care is taken that none of their posterity should minister before God but such as were every way perfect; nor were any blemished animals ever to be allowed to come upon the sacred altar. The order of the several anniversary festivals having been also determined in the preceding chapter, the writer comes in the present to treat of the daily service of God in the sanctuary, which was not fully settled in all its details till the princes had made their offerings, Num. 7. 1, 2, &c. Its contents, however, are somewhat of a varied character, several items of an incidental nature being introduced in the course of it.

CHAPTER XXIV.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 [a] Command the children of Israel, that they bring unto thee pure oil-olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamps to burn continually.

3 Without the vail of the testimony, in the tabernacle of the congregation, shall Aaron order it from the evening unto the morning before the LORD continually: *it shall be* a statute for ever in your generations.

[a] Exod. 27. 20, 21.

4 He shall order the lamps upon [b] the pure candlestick before the LORD continually.

5 ¶ And thou shalt take fine flour, and bake twelve [c] cakes thereof: two tenth-deals shall be in one cake.

6 And thou shalt set them in two rows, six on a row, [d] upon the pure table before the LORD.

7 And thou shall put pure frankincense upon *each* row, that it may be on the bread for a memorial,

[b] Exod. 31. 8, and 39. 37. [c] Exod. 25. 30. [d] 1 Kings 7. 48. 2 Chron. 4. 19, and 13. 11. Heb. 9. 2.

The Oil for the Lamps.

2. *To cause the lamps to burn.* Heb. להעלת נר *lehaaloth nër, to cause the lamp to ascend;* i. e. the light or flame of the lamp. Our version gives 'lamps,' in the plural, although the Heb. has 'lamp.' Yet in v. 4, the original has 'lamps,' plural. It is doubtless used here as a collective, all the seven lamps being considered as forming but one. In like manner, and in direct allusion to this, the Holy Spirit, though one, is represented by 'seven lamps of fire before the throne,' Rev. 4. 5; for there are 'diversities of gifts, but one spirit.' Comp. Ex. 27. 20, Num. 8. 2, 1 Sam. 3. 3.——¶ *Continually.* Heb. תמיד *tamid.* That is, from night to night; *not* without intermission. So the 'continual burnt-offering' means that which was regularly offered at the appointed season. So Mephibosheth was to eat bread at David's table *continually*, i. e. at the stated hours of meals, 2 Sam. 9. 7, 13. In like manner when the Apostle says, 1 Thess. 3. 17, 'Pray without ceasing,' his meaning undoubtedly is, that they were to pray constantly, morning and evening, at the stated hours of prayer.

3. *Without the vail of the testimony.* That is, 'without the second vail,' as it is termed, Heb. 9. 3, which separated between the holy and most holy place. The ark of the covenant is here called 'the testimony,' because it contained the *tables of the testimony*, as they are called, Ex. 25. 21.——¶ *From the evening unto the morning.* The Hebrew word בכר *boker*, properly signifies that portion of the morning which intervenes between the break of day and sunrise. The other word, ערב *ereb*, implies the time from sunset to dark. The priests, therefore, were to look after the lamps from very early in the morning to late at night.

The Ordering of the Table of Shew-bread.

6. *Thou shalt set them in two rows six in a row, upon the pure table before the Lord.* These loaves are called elsewhere the 'bread of the presence,' the mystical import of which we have fully considered in the Notes on Ex. 20. 30. They were prepared by the Levites, and were twelve in number, to correspond with the twelve tribes of Israel. The table is called 'the pure table,' just as the candlestick is called, v. 4, 'the pure candlestick,' from the pure gold with which it was overlaid, and which was doubtless always kept clean and bright.

7. *That it may be on the bread for a memorial.* That is, that the frankin-

even an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

8 [e] Every sabbath he shall set it in order before the LORD continually, *being taken* from the children of Israel by an everlasting covenant.

9 And [f] it shall be Aaron's and his sons'; [g] and they shall eat it in the holy place: for it *is* most holy unto him of the offerings of the LORD made by fire by a perpetual statute.

10 ¶ And the son of an Israelitish woman, whose father *was* an Egyptian, went out among the children of Israel; and this son of the Israelitish *woman* and a man of Israel strove together in the camp;

[e] Numb. 4. 7. 1 Chron. 9. 32. 2 Chron. 2. 4. [f] 1 Sam. 21. 6. Matt. 12. 4. Mark 2. 26. Luke 6. 4. [g] Exod. 29. 33. ch. 8. 3, and 21. 22.

---

cense may be burnt upon the altar of incense, instead of the bread; as the handful of the meal-offering with its oil and incense, Lev. 2. 2, was to be a memorial of the whole. The frankincense stood in a golden saucer upon the bread during the whole week: on the Sabbath the bread was taken away to be eaten, and the frankincense was burnt in lieu of it. As incense is a symbol of prayer, there may have been an intimation in this appointment, that our spiritual food is to be received and sanctified with prayer. Indeed, when a good man sits down at his table and invokes the divine blessing upon his daily food, we seem to see the *realized substance* of the vessels of incense upon the Levitical loaves.

8. Being taken *from the children of Israel*. It was taken from the children of Israel, inasmuch as it was bought with the money which they contributed. The yearly half-shekel tribute, ordained Ex. 30. 13, 16, was doubtless devoted to defraying the expenses of the service of the sanctuary.

Of the Blaspheming Son of Shelomith.

10. *The son of an Israelitish woman whose father was an Egyptian, went out among the children of Israel*, &c. The insertion of this historical narrative in this connexion, in the midst of a body of ceremonial and moral laws, has somewhat of a singular air, but may perhaps be satisfactorily explained from the hint afforded v. 22, 'Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country; for I am the Lord your God.' As the writer is treating in the present chapter of several particulars of the criminal laws, the question would naturally arise whether and how far those laws were to bear upon foreigners, dwelling among them as proselytes. The answer to this question is not only expressly stated in v. 22, but the pertinent case of the Egyptian Israelite is also brought in by way of illustration. The original Hebrew, as rendered literally, runs thus:—'And there went out a son of an Israelitess, and he the son of an Egyptian man, in the midst of, or among the children of Israel,' &c., which the Jewish writers generally understand as implying that the father was a proselyte to the Hebrew faith, as Aben-ezra in particular says, 'he was received into the number of the Jews.' This is not, perhaps, improbable in itself, for as it was now little more than a year since they came out of Egypt, and yet his son was old enough to strive with a man of Israel, he had no doubt married the Israelitish woman at least some fifteen or twenty years before the exodus; and if so, the presumption would no doubt be, that he had embraced the religion of her whom he had chosen for a wife. Still there is evidently no certainty in the intimation, and we must take it for what it is worth. It is impossible to feel much respect for the judgment of men who are constantly prone to give a tongue to the silence of scripture, and supply its omissions with the extravagant and silly fictions of their own teeming fancies; a specimen

11 And the Israelitish woman's son [h] blasphemed the name *of the LORD*, and [i] cursed; and they [k] brought him unto Moses: (and his mother's name *was* Shelomith, the daughter of Dibri, of the tribe of Dan:)

[h] ver. 16. [i] Job 1. 5, 11, 22, and 2. 5, 9, 10. Isai. 8. 21.

[k] Exod. 18. 22. 26.

of which is to be seen in the asserted genealogy which they have ascribed to this son of Shelomith, making his father to be no other than the man whom Moses killed in Egypt. But we know nothing more, for we are told nothing more, respecting this bold transgressor, than that he was now enumerated in the congregation of Israel, and that he was guilty of the high-handed crime here recited. As to the 'going out' spoken of in the text, it is not clear what is to be understood by the expression; whether it refers to his *coming out of Egypt*, or simply to his *going out of his tent*, and engaging in strife abroad. We incline to the former opinion.

11. *And the Israelitish woman's son blasphemed the name* of the Lord, *and cursed.* Heb. נקב את השם ויקלל *yikkob eth hashshem va-yekallël, blasphemed the name, and cursed.* The words, 'of the Lord,' it will be perceived, are supplied, not being found in the original. Nor does any one of the ancient versions, the Chal., the Sam., the Syr., the Arab., the Sept., or the Vulg., attempt to supply the sacred name. There can be no doubt, however, that the words are properly supplied, and that his crime was a bold and impious profaning the august name of Jehovah, which name is perhaps omitted by the writer in order to evince a reverence strikingly in contrast with the daring hardihood of the offender. The original word נקב *yikkob*, from נקב *nâkab, to pierce, bore, or strike through*, is probably used in this connexion to imply that blasphemy is a kind of *striking through* or *wounding* with the tongue, as it is said in Proverbs, 'There is that speaketh *the piercings of a sword.*' It is elsewhere used in the same sense, as Num. 23. 13, 25, Job. 3. 8,—5. 3. So, also, the Arabic renders it by a word signifying primarily to *cut* or *perforate*, and thence used figuratively for *cursing* or *malediction.* Yet it is certain that the Hebrew term is employed by way of secondary usage in the sense of *declaring* or *expressing distinctly, specifying, calling by name*, as Gen. 30. 28, Num. 1. 17, Is. 62. 3, and hence, the Jews, from a very early period, considered themselves as prohibited from uttering the name 'Jehovah,' except on the most sacred occasions, as it is well known that in reading their Scriptures they universally substituted אדני *adonai, Lord*, for יהוה *Yehovah*, wherever it occurs, and in their writings employ השם *hashshem, the name*, the very word in the passage before us. It is also to be remarked, that the Gr. has επονομασας το ονομα, *having named the name*, while Onkelos and the Syriac have, *distinctly expressed*, and the Arab. of Erpenius, *pronounced.* The probability, we think is, that this idea is actually included in the meaning of the term; that there was a *distinct* and at the same time *opprobrious* and *profane utterance* of that name which is above every name, the holy designation of the infinite and eternal God, which ought never to be uttered without a trembling awe upon the spirit. Houbigant, indeed, and some others, suppose that the blasphemer did not use the name of the true God at all, but had been swearing by one of the gods of his country, and that his crime was mentioning the name of a *strange god* in the camp of Israel. But upon reference to the law, enacted v. 16, there seems no good reason to consider this a sound interpretation; for we find that השם *hashshĕm, the name*, in the latter part of the verse answers to שם יהוה *shĕm Yehovah*,

12 And they [l]put him in ward, [m]that the mind of the LORD might be shewed them.

13 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

14 Bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp; and let all that heard *him* [n]lay their hands upon his head, and let all the congregation stone him.

[l] Numb. 15. 34. [m] Exod. 18. 15, 16. Num. 27. 5, and 36. 5, 6.

[n] Deut. 13. 9, and 17. 7.

the name of Jehovah, in the former part. The Jews also frequently use השם *hashshĕm*, for JEHOVAH; and that it was an ancient custom thus to allude to the Deity, without mentioning his name, appears from inscriptions among the Palmyrenians, on whose marbles we find, 'To the blessed NAME be fear for ever——to the blessed NAME, for ever good, and merciful, be fear——to the blessed NAME for ever be fear,' &c.——¶ *And cursed.* It is not unlikely that being arraigned before the magistrates, and sentence being given against him, he in a fit of exasperation spoke blasphemous words against God, renouncing his worship, and cursing the judges who had condemned him.——¶ *And they brought him unto Moses*, &c. The case was new and unprecedented, and as there was no law by which the amount of guilt could be determined, nor, consequently, the degree of punishment, it was necessary to consult the Great Lawgiver on the occasion. Moses, no doubt, had recourse to the tabernacle, and received the directions afterwards mentioned, from the Shekinah dwelling between the cherubim. The answer was probably by the Urim and Thummim.

12. *And they put him in ward, that the mind of the Lord might be shewed them.* Chal. 'Until it was expounded unto them by the decree of the Word of the Lord.' Gr. διακριναι αυτον δια προσταγματος Κυριου, *to judge him by the commandment of the Lord.* Imprisonment is no where mentioned in the books of Moses, or in the early historical books, as a punishment, but only as a means of keeping a criminal in safe custody till the time of trial. As a precedent was now to be set for future ages, it became them to proceed with due deliberation.

14. *Bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp.* As the camp of Israel was holy, the execution of one who had rendered himself so abominable and accursed would bring a defilement upon it which was not to be tolerated.——¶ *Lay their hands upon his head.* By this testimony the people who heard him curse bore their public testimony in order to his being fully convicted; and it was moreover a significant mode of saying to the man, 'Thy blood be upon thine own head; we hereby clear ourselves of all participation in thy guilt.' We find no other instance of this ceremony of the imposition of hands in the case of a condemned malefactor, and the Jews hold it to be peculiar to the sin of blasphemy. 'Of all that are killed,' says Maimonides, 'by the Sanhedrin, there is none upon whom they impose hands save the blasphemer only.' These remarks will be found to illustrate the account given in the New Testament of the deaths of our Lord and of St. Stephen, who were both murdered under a false charge of blasphemy. The crime of the judges and witnesses in *these* cases was in declaring them guilty of blasphemy, not in pronouncing blasphemy to deserve death. The criminal codes of most Christian countries have denounced death as the ultimate punishment of blasphemy, in imitation of the law in this chapter: but these codes differ very much in the definition of blasphemy; and it is perhaps owing to this that the capital penalty is at present nowhere enforced even where it retains

15 And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, Whosoever curseth his God [o] shall bear his sin.

16 And he that [p] blasphemeth the name of the LORD, he shall surely be put to death, *and* all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name *of the* LORD, shall be put to death.

17 ¶ [q] And he that killeth any man shall surely be put to death.

18 [r] And he that killeth a beast shall make it good; beast for beast.

19 And if a man cause a blemish

o ch. 5. 1, and 20. 17. Numb. 9. 13.
p 1 Kings 21. 10, 13. Ps. 74. 10, 1c Matt. 12. 31. Mark 3. 28, Jam. 2. 7.

q Exod. 21. 12. Numb. 35. 31. Deut. 19. 11, 12. r ver. 21.

its place in the statute-books. In estimating the enormity of the offence, we must not overlook the circumstance of aggravation, that the act of blasphemy against Jehovah was both a religious and political crime, he being not only the God, but the king of the Hebrew nation.

15. *And thou shalt speak*, &c. The present transaction, as might be expected, gave rise to a standing law on the subject. Whoever spake disrespectfully or reproachingly of God, under any of his titles, was to be put to death.

16. *He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord*, &c. Heb. נקב שם יהוה *nokĕb shĕm Yehovah, the blasphemer of the name of Jehovah.* Chal. 'He that expresseth.' Gr. *ονομαζων το ονομα κυριου, he that nameth the name of the Lord.* The original is the same word that occurs v. 11, and here, as there, implies a *blasphemous, distinct uttering.* Whether the clause is intended to express a higher degree of the sin mentioned in the preceding verse, or whether it is only a repetition of the same sentence, with a more express designation of the punishment, is uncertain. The Jews, for the most part, understand it of him only who *expressed the name*, i. e. the most holy name of God, or *Jehovah*, as the Targ. Jerus. says, on Deut. 32., 'Woe unto those that in their execrations use the holy name, which it is not lawful for the highest angel to express.' But Maimonides says, 'There be some that expound it, that he is not guilty of death save for the name 'Jehovah.' Yet I say, for 'Adonai' also he is to be stoned.' It was from this passage especially that the rabbinical restraint arose as to uttering the name 'Jehovah,' either in reading the Scriptures or otherwise, except in the sanctuary, when the priest blesses the people, according to the law, Num. 6. 23-27. And so long was this practice in vogue among them that the true pronunciation of the word has become lost; the current pronunciation depending upon vowels that do not belong to it. But there is no question that this is merely a superstitious scruple, for which nothing more than a forced traditionary interpretation can be pleaded.

The Law of Murder.

17. *He that killeth any man.* Heb. רכה כל נפש אדם *yakkeh kol nephesh âdâm, that smiteth the life, or soul, of a man.* As this statute has been before explained, Ex. 21. 12, the only question here, is respecting the reasons of its insertion in this connexion. The true answer is perhaps to be gathered from the context. The subsequent verses evince that both native-born Israelites and sojourning proselytes were to be subject to the same penal laws. Inasmuch, then, as a stranger was to be put to death for killing a man, let no one deem it hard that he should be punished for blasphemy with equal severity with the son of Israel. It seems to be introduced by way of obviating a query that might arise as to punishing blas-

in his neighbour; as [s] he hath done, so shall it be done unto him:

20 Breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth: as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done to him *again*.

21 [t] And he that killeth a beast, he shall restore it: [u] and he that killeth a man, he shall be put to death.

22 Ye shall have [x] one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country: for I *am* the LORD your God.

23 ¶ And Moses spake to the children of Israel, [y] that they should bring forth him that had cursed out of the camp, and stone him with stones: and the children of Israel did as the LORD commanded Moses.

[s] Exod. 21. 24. Deut. 19. 21. Matt. 5. 38, and 7. 2. [t] Exod. 21. 33. ver. 18. [u] ver. 17. [x] Exod. 12. 49. ch. 19. 34. Numb. 15. 16. [y] ver. 14.

---

phemy in a foreigner, in so exemplary a manner.

As to the remaining precepts in this chapter, the marginal references will point to the places where they are minutely explained.

REMARKS.—(10–16.) The prominent reflection suggested by the present narrative is, the greatness and grievousness of the sin of blasphemy. If we are assured that for every *idle* word which men shall speak they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment, how much more for every *profane* and *impious* one! If even *neglect* of God be a high offence against him, in whom we live, and move, and have our being, and who has given his son to die for our sins, how much deeper in enormity and blacker in dye must be such contempt and defiance of his majesty! How fearful to give way to the evil passions which prompt the lips to break forth in irreverent and blasphemous exclamations! Although the man who is guilty of this iniquity may not now come under an express statute that condemns him to death, yet let him not forget that there is an ear which hears, and a book of remembrance that contains all his 'ungodly speeches,' and will assuredly mete out to him the due reward of his guilt.

It is moreover to be remembered that blasphemy is not confined to the mere profane use of the name or titles of the Most High. Any kind of disparaging or contemptuous reflections thrown out against the power or grace of God comes into the same category in the estimation of the Scriptures. Thus Rabshakeh is charged with blasphemy for asserting that the God of Israel had no more power than the gods of the heathen. And thus the Psalmist pleads, 'O God, how long shall the adversary reproach, shall the many *blaspheme* thy name for ever?' Thus, moreover, Paul says of himself that he was before his conversion a *blasphemer*, because he had spoken against and opposed the grace of Christ; and doubtless it is for the same reason that James says of the rich men of his day, 'Do they not *blaspheme* that worthy name by which ye are called?' And while opposition to Christ is thus looked upon in Scripture, how dreadful is the denunciation against this sin when committed against the Holy Ghost. From all this we cannot but be reminded how careful it behoves us to be not to reproach the Lord in his word, or works, or ways; not to object against the Gospel, or to endeavor to hinder its progress, and not to detract from those glorious operations of power or grace wrought by the Holy Spirit in the souls of men, lest we incur the guilt of this fearful sin.

And lastly, let us beware of causing others to blaspheme. We may lead men to curse by irritating their passions, and we may cause them to speak evil of the Lord by the commission of sins which shall bring discredit upon reli-

CHAPTER XXV.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, saying,
2 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep [a] a sabbath unto the LORD.

[a] Exod. 23. 10. See ch. 26. 34, 35. 2 Chron. 36. 21.

---

gion. See a melancholy instance of this in the history of David, and the heavy charge brought against him on this very account; 'Because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to *blaspheme*.' Hear the strong reproof of the apostle Paul to the Jews who lived not according to the principles and precepts of their law, 'The name of God,' says he, 'is *blasphemed* among the Gentiles through you.' And alas, it is chargeable upon many nominal Christians, to their great reproach and shame, that while residing in foreign lands among heathens, Mahometans, and other rejecters of the Gospel, they live in a manner so negligent of religion, and so dissolute as to bring the greatest disgrace upon the sacred cause of Christianity. The same effects may be produced by those who live at home. It is to be feared that many a one has been encouraged in sin, hardened in heart, and driven to the grossest enormities in profane swearing and cursing, and every breach of the divine law, by the irreligious and immoral lives of persons, and by the scoffing and contemptuous speech of those professing the religion of Christ. God forbid that we should thus dishonor the truth, and ruin our souls!

CHAPTER XXV.

The Law of the Sabbatical Year.

1. *And the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai.* That is, in the wilderness or region of Sinai, in the vicinity of the mount, where the people were now encamped. 'Mount' is often used in the Scriptures for 'mountainous region.' The congregation remained for a year in the neighborhood of the hallowed mount, from whence they did not remove till the twentieth day of the second month of the second year after their coming out of Egypt, Num. 10. 11, 12. All that is here related was undoubtedly delivered to Moses in the first month of the second year after the exodus, immediately subsequent to the setting up of the tabernacle, Ex. 40. 17.

2. *Then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the Lord.* Heb. שבתה ארץ שבת ליהוה *shâbethâh eretz shabbâth laihovah, shall the land sabbatize a sabbath unto the Lord.* Gr. *αναπαυσεται ἡ γη, the land shall rest.* Chal. 'The land shall be remitted a remission,' which, though a barbarism in our language, still conveys an intelligible idea. This year of rest to the land is a very prominent feature of the sabbatic system, which formed so prominent and distinguishing a part of the Hebrew polity. As man was commanded and privileged on the seventh day to abstain from that labor to which he had subjected himself by sin, so, on the seventh year, the earth was also to rest, and enjoy, as it were, a respite from the effects of the curse. The prominent circumstances which distinguished the sabbatical year from common years may be thus enumerated. (1.) All agricultural operations were to be suspended, and the land was to lie fallow. The whole country must, in fact, have been thrown into one vast common, free to the poor and the stranger, to the domestic cattle and the game; for the proprietor of the land not only ceased to cultivate it, but had no exclusive right to its spontaneous produce, although he might share in it. (2.) The produce of every sixth year was promised to be such as would support them till the harvest of the

3 Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard, and gather in the fruit thereof;

4 But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the LORD: thou shalt

ninth year; a circumstance which would clearly demonstrate a particular providence in respect to the institution. (3.) It was a season of release from debts due from one Israelite to another; but not those due from foreigners to Israelites. (4.) Every Hebrew slave had the option of being released this year from his servitude. At least this is often inferred from Ex. 21. 2; but it will be seen by reference to the Note on that passage to be quite doubtful whether the seventh year there mentioned was not the seventh year of his actual service, rather than the sabbatical year. (5.) In the sabbatical year, at the feast of tabernacles, they were enjoined to read the law in the hearing of all the people. This was called by the Rabbinical writers 'the reading of the king,' because tradition made the king himself the reader on this occasion.

It is not to be supposed that this year of rest to the land was necessarily spent by the Hebrews in idleness. They could fish, hunt, take care of their bees and flocks, repair their buildings and furniture, manufacture clothes, and carry on their usual traffic.

In adverting to the various political and moral designs of this institution, we may observe, in the first place, that the land itself would experience the happy effects of lying fallow one year, in itself. Incessant culture tends to exhaust the strength of the soil, although this is in great measure counteracted in modern times by the expedient of a *rotation of crops*. But there is no doubt that among the Israelites the land remaining one year untilled, would recruit itself for a more vigorous fertility afterwards. Again, the institution was calculated to remind the chosen people that God was the great Proprietor of all, and that they were mere tenants, holding their earthly possessions upon certain prescribed conditions, with which they could not safely dispense. Closely connected with this, was the influence which the Sabbatic year would have in cherishing appropriate sentiments of piety, and leading them to a practical trust in an overruling providence. When they saw the Sabbatic year at hand, how forcibly would they be impressed with the goodness of God in making provision for it! They would have *three* years to live on the produce of one single year. And when they beheld their barns overflowing with the produce of the earth, and their presses bursting out with new wine, could they refrain from saying, 'This is the hand of the Lord; how can we but feel deeply sensible to his love and kindness? How can we refuse to love, serve, and trust forever so gracious a benefactor?' The observance of this season was, in fact, a test of their belief in the immediate superintending providence of God, and grieved we are to be obliged to say, that under this test the Israelites failed; and their failure was a national sin, which constituted one of the grand procuring causes of their subsequent long captivity in Babylon. This fact seems to be anticipated, Lev. 26. 33–35, as not unlikely to happen, and when the captivity actually came, the years of its continuance corresponded with the number of the neglected sabbatic years; and as these were seventy, this would carry us back about 500 years to the commencement of the kingly government, as the time at which the observance was discontinued. After the captivity it was more scrupulously observed.

4. *A sabbath of rest unto the land.* Heb. שבת שבתון *shabbath shabbathon, a sabbath of sabbatism;* a phrase of

neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard.

5 [b] That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest, thou shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed: *for* it is a year of rest unto the land.

6 And the sabbath of the land shall be meat for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy stranger that sojourneth with thee,

7 And for thy cattle, and for the beast that *are* in thy land, shall all the increase thereof be meat.

8 ¶ And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years.

[b] 2 Kings 19. 29.

great intensity of import, which we have previously explained. In its typical scope the ordinance no doubt pointed forward to the great sabbatical period of the world, which according to a very ancient Jewish tradition, is to succeed the previous six thousand years. These, according to the Rabbins, are distributed as follows;—Two thousand before the law; two thousand under the law; and two thousand under the Messiah. Then comes the grand period of bliss and glory to the world.——¶ *Thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard.* That is, the superfluous shoots and branches which the husbandman cuts to make the trees more fruitful.

5. *Neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed.* Heb. ענבי נזירך *innebë nezirëka, the grapes of thy separation.* Gr. την σταφυλην του ἁγιασματος σου, *the grapes of the sanctification.* Chal. 'the vine of thy leaving;' i. e. which thou art to leave uncultivated.' The original word נזירך *nezirëka*, is derived from נזר *nazar, to separate*, from which comes 'Nazarite,' *one separated*, one devoted to God for a season by special consecration. One requisite in this case, was that the hair should be suffered to grow without being shaven; and in like manner the vineyard of the Israelites being in a sense *consecrated* to God for the space of the sabbatical year, it was to be left in the condition of the Nazarite's head, untouched by knife or pruning-hook. This is the reason of its being rendered in our translation 'undressed.'

6. *The sabbath of the land shall be meat for you.* 'Sabbath of the land' is here used by a figure of speech for the *fruit of the sabbath*, i. e. of the sabbatical year. In like manner the word 'sabbaths' is used ch. 23. 38, for *the sacrifices of the sabbath.* It would seem from this that the prohibition of gathering corn and fruits in this year was not absolute, for the products of the vine and olive, and the milk and honey would continue as usual.

The Jubilee.

8. *Thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years.* The term 'sabbath' here is used in the sense of 'week,' as before explained, so that as a literal week consisted of seven days, a sabbath of weeks consisted of seven years. It is not, however, to be understood that the jubilee was to be celebrated on the *forty-ninth*, but on the *fiftieth* year, as is evident from v. 11. The forty-ninth was the ordinary seventh or sabbatical year, so that, in fact, two holy years came together. Thus writes Maimonides: 'The year of jubilee cometh not into the count of the years of the seven; but the nine and fortieth year is the release, and the fiftieth year the jubilee.' The jubilee, therefore, was proclaimed on the *forty-ninth* and celebrated on the *fiftieth* year.

The institution here described is one of the most interesting and important of all the appointments which characterized the Jewish economy. It commenced on the first day of the month

Tisri, that is, the civil new year's day. Its distinguishing features were the following:—

(1.) As in the sabbatical year, so in this, the people were neither to sow nor to reap, and the spontaneous products of the earth were to be accounted common property. Thus there were two years at every jubilee, when the Jews neither sowed nor reaped; namely, the jubilee and the year before, which was always a sabbatical year; and hence we see the reason why the promise of support, given in Lev. 25. 20–22, was from the sixth till the harvest of the ninth year. We have only two passages of Scripture where this promise is alluded to, viz., 2 Kings 19. 29, and Is. 37. 30.

(2.) The second thing remarkable in the year of jubilee was, that all the lands which had been sold by one Hebrew to another, had a reference to this, being valued according to its proximity or remoteness, in order to their being restored in that year; or might be redeemed sooner by giving to the owner a proper compensation.

(3.) All sales of houses in the country, were returned likewise at that time, or could have been redeemed sooner; but all dwelling houses in walled cities, unless redeemed within a year, remained for ever with the possessor, except in the case of houses belonging to the Levites, which might have been redeemed at any time, although in walled cities; and if not redeemed, returned to them again as a matter of course in the year of jubilee.

(4.) All Israelites who on account of poverty had sold themselves, that is to say their services, to Israelites, were not to be reckoned as bond, but as hired servants, and were to return unto their families and fathers' possessions in the year of jubilee.

(5.) All poor Israelites who on account of poverty had sold themselves to proselytes, were to be accounted hired servants, and might be redeemed at any time by their relatives or themselves; but, if not redeemed, were to obtain their liberty at the jubilee.

(6.) As the Jewish kings had commonly much in their power, they were expressly forbidden, on the one hand, to seize the possession of any Israelite as a provision for their family, or on the other to squander the royal domains on favorites, as that would have lessened the patrimony of the crown; and if any such grants were at any time made, they reverted, of course, to the original proprietors in the year of jubilee.

Such was the nature of the Jewish jubilee; but we do not find that any particular sacrifices were appointed, nor even that reading of the law which was enjoined in the sabbatical year; neither is it clear at what hour of the day of annual expiation the silver trumpets sounded to announce its commencement. It is probable, however, that it was in the evening, after the high priest had entered the most holy place, the scape goat had been sent into the wilderness, and the people, in full concert in the temple, had been praising the Lord for his goodness, and because his mercy endureth for ever. Imagination may conceive, but it is beyond the power of language to describe, the general burst of joy that would pervade the land, when the poor Israelites tasted again the sweets of liberty, and returned to their possessions, their families, and friends. In vain would sleep invite them to repose—their hearts would be too full to feel the lassitude of nature; and the night would be spent in gratitude and praise. What a lively emblem of the gospel of Christ! which is peculiarly addressed to the poor, which is fitted to heal the broken hearted, to give deliverance to the captives, the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound, and to preach unto all the acceptable year of the Lord.

The true origin of the term 'Jubilee' is somewhat doubtful. We trace it indeed to the Heb. יובל *yobĕl*, but the

genuine sense of this word is the great matter of debate. Some derive it from Jubal, the inventor of musical instruments, Gen. 4. 21, and suppose that this year was named after him from its being a year of mirth and joy, on which music is a common attendant. Our English word *jovial* is traced to the same origin. Others, particularly D. Kimchi, contend that *jobel* (*yobel*) signifies *a ram* in Arabic, and that this year was so called because it was proclaimed with *trumpets made of rams' horns*. This is somewhat countenanced by the Chal. Targ. which occasionally renders *yobel* by דיכרא *dikra, a ram*. Bochart and others, however, doubt whether rams' horns were ever employed as trumpets, but think that the 'horns,' cornets,' &c. of the Scripture were either the horns of oxen, or brazen trumpets *in the form of rams' horns*. Hottinger is of opinion that *yobel* is a word designed to denote rather the peculiar kind of sound made by the instrument, than the instrument itself. Bishop Patrick espouses this etymology, and conceives the year to have been called *yobel* from the sound every where made, just as the feast of the Passover was called פסח *pesa'h*, from the angel's *passing over* the Israelites when he slew the Egyptians. Another, and perhaps as probable an opinion as any of the preceding is, that יובל *yobël* comes from the verb יבל *yâbal*, which in Hiphil is הוביל *hobil*, and signifies *to recall, restore, bring back;* because this year *restored* liberty to the slaves, and *brought back* alienated estates to their original possessors. This would seem to be the view which the Sept. takes of the word by rendering it *αφεσις, a remission*, and also Josephus, who renders it *ελευθηριαν, liberty*. From this variety of interpretations the reader is necessarily left by the commentator to choose that which he deems most plausible. Absolute certainty is unattainable.

Whatever may be the meaning of the term, and whatever the nature of the instruments employed, it is held by all the Jewish writers that trumpets were sounded extensively all over the land, in the mountains, in the streets, and at nearly every door. It was intended as a universal waking up of all the population to the occurrence of this joyous festival. It was not enough that the year and the day should be fixed, and come round in silence. The spirits which had been depressed by great reverses of fortune were to be exhilarated by the cheering annunciation, and all indifference and torpor to be shaken off. The Jubilee in fact began on the first day of the month Tisri, but the real objects of the institution did not develope themselves till the tenth which was the great day of atonement. But the previous nine days were spent in great festivity and joy, resembling in some respects the Roman Saturnalia. The slaves did no work for their masters, but crowned themselves with garlands, and ate, and drank, and made merry. On the tenth day, the proper authorities, called 'the house of judgment,' or the great Sanhedrim, directed the trumpets to be sounded; and at that instant the bondmen became free, and lands reverted to their original owners.

The two grand distinguishing characteristics of the Jubilee were evidently manumission of servants and the restitution of estates. If any of the Israelites had been reduced to a state of slavery, whether he had sold himself voluntarily, or had been sold for debt, or theft, or any other cause, by the sentence of the judge, now was the season of his release. The day dawned; the trumpet-peal was heard, and the chains of bondage fell from the exulting slave. With his wife and children, and all that he had, he set forth from the house of his bondage, and felt himself possessed of liberty which no hand of power or of fraud might invade. Even those who had not seen fit to avail themselves of the emancipation afforded by the law at the end of six years' ser-

9 Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound, on the tenth *day* of the seventh month,

vitude, but had expressed their determination, by having their ears bored with an awl, and fastened to the door of their master's house, were now to go out perfectly free under the general proclamation of liberty to the captive. How striking a type of the release from spiritual thraldom as announced at the Gospel Jubilee, when our Saviour in the synagogue read from the prophet Isaiah, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord;' and then added, 'This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears.' The Gospel dispensation is the sinner's jubilee, and as the word 'jubilee' implies a joyful sound, so the word 'Gospel' signifies glad tidings; and blessed are they who hear and welcome the sound of joy which it sends forth.

No less benign and gracious was the other feature of this remarkable institution. If any of the Israelites, through misfortune, imprudence, or misconduct, had been obliged to sell his patrimonial lands, or any part of them, they were returned to him free of incumbrance at the year of Jubilee, if he could not redeem them sooner. No matter how often the property had changed hands, it was now restored to the original owner or to his heirs. The Israelite whom calamity or improvidence had driven abroad, needed no longer to wander for want of a home of his own to welcome him. A home there always was, would he but choose to reclaim it. How wise and merciful this appointment! How admirably adapted to preserve a wholesome equality of condition among all classes! The rich could not accumulate all the lands, nor establish a permanent monopoly of wealth. The man of avarice, who had gone on adding house to house and field to field, gained no permanent advantage over his less fortunate neighbor. The fiftieth year, beyond which no lease could run, was always approaching with silent but sure speed, to relax his tenacious grasp. However alienated, however unworthily or unthriftily sold, however strongly conveyed to the purchaser or the usurper an estate might be, this long-expected day annulled the whole transaction, and placed the debtor in the condition which either himself or his ancestor had enjoyed. In virtue, moreover, of this gracious ordinance forbidding the perpetual alienation of the land, a regular genealogy of every particular tribe and family would be preserved, and thus evidence afforded of the exact fulfilment of the prophecies respecting the Messiah, and the stock from which he should spring.

So marked was the wisdom, so manifold the blessings of this divine institution! That its typical import conducts us onward to the heart of the gospel economy, as ushered in by Christ, we have already remarked. But that it has a reach still more extended, and, like the sabbatical year, shadows out a state of permanent prosperity, happiness, joy, and glory, in the latter periods of this world's history, we have no doubt. Like many other features of the Levitical economy, its *substance* has never yet been realized. That is reserved for that blissful era announced by the seventh, or jubilee trumpet of the Apocalypse, when the grand consummation of all prophetic blessedness shall take place.

9. *Thou shalt cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound.* Heb. העברת שופר תרועה *haabarta shophër teruah, shalt cause to pass through the trumpet of loud sound.* That is, shalt cause it

[c] in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land.

10 And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and [d] proclaim liberty throughout *all* the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; [e] and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family.

11 A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you: [f] ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, nor gather *the grapes* in it of thy vine undressed.

12 For it *is* the jubilee; it shall be holy unto you: [g] ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field.

13 [h] In the year of this jubilee ye shall return every man unto his possession.

14 And if thou sell aught unto thy neighbour, or buyest *aught* of thy neighbour's hand, [i] ye shall not oppress one another:

[c] ch. 23. 24, 27. [d] Isai. 61. 2, and 63. 4. Jer. 34. 8, 15, 17. Luke 4. 19. [e] ver. 13. Numb. 36. 4. [f] ver. 5.

[g] ver. 6, 7. [h] ver. 10. ch. 27. 24. Numb. 36. 4. [i] ver. 17. ch. 19. 13. 1 Sam. 12. 3, 4. Mic. 2. 2. 1 Cor. 6. 8.

to be sounded all over the land from one end to the other, that the most general proclamation might be made. Thus in Ezra 1. 1, 'The Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he *made a proclamation* throughout all his kingdom.' Heb. 'He *made a voice to pass through* all his kingdom.' The Hebrew word answering to 'jubilee' in the next verse does not occur here, and the utmost accuracy would perhaps have led to the adoption of another mode of rendering. In Num. 10. 5, the word for 'loud sound' is rendered 'alarm'—'when ye blow *an alarm*.'——¶ *In the day of atonement.* This was the general fast-day, in which, with every returning year, the whole congregation humbled themselves and afflicted their souls before God, and the high-priest made atonement for them in the holy place. The annunciation of the jubilee was very wisely fixed to this period, as it might be considered that they would be better disposed to forgive their brethren their debts when they had so recently been receiving the pardon of their own trespasses. The Jubilee was a festival of joy, and a sanctified joy can be preceded by nothing more suitable than deep humiliation and godly sorrow for sin.

10. *Proclaim liberty.* That is, liberty for Hebrew servants to leave the service of their masters; particularly such as had not availed themselves of the privilege granted, Ex. 21. 2, 6, of going out of servitude on the seventh year, but had their ears bored as a signal of serving 'for ever,' or until the year of jubilee arrived. But now that year having arrived, their 'ever' was at an end, and they went out of course.——¶ *Ye shall return every man unto his possession.* To his house or land, which he may have been compelled to sell, and to his family, from which he may have been estranged by the loss of his liberty. The Israelites had a portion of land divided to each family by lot. This portion of the promised land they held of God, and were not to dispose of it as their property in fee-simple. Hence no Israelite could part with his landed estate but for a term of years only. When the jubilee arrived it again reverted to the original owners.

12. *Ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field.* That is, the spontaneous increase or produce.

14. *If thou sell aught,* &c. As the divine lawgiver took care that the wealth of some should not oppress the poverty of others, by the law of jubilee that a poor man should not lose his land for ever; so in buying the land of the poor he would not have the rich give less for it than it was worth, any more

15 [k] According to the number of years after the jubilee, thou shalt buy of thy neighbour, *and* according unto the number of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee:

16 According to the multitude of years thou shalt increase the price thereof, and according to the fewness of years thou shalt diminish the price of it: for *according* to the number *of the years* of the fruits doth he sell unto thee.

17 [l] Ye shall not therefore oppress one another; [m] but thou shalt fear thy God: for I *am* the LORD your God.

18 ¶ [n] Wherefore ye shall do my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them; [o] and ye shall dwell in the land in safety.

19 And the land shall yield her fruit, and [p] ye shall eat your fill, and dwell therein in safety.

20 And if ye shall say, [q] What shall we eat the seventh year? behold, [r] we shall not sow nor gather in our increase:

21 Then I will [s] command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years.

22 [t] And ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat *yet* of [u] old fruit until the ninth year; until her fruits come in ye shall eat *of* the old *store*.

23 ¶ The land shall not be sold for ever; for [x] the land *is* mine, for ye *are* [y] strangers and sojourners with me.

[k] ch. 27. 18, 23. [l] ver. 14. [m] ver. 43. ch. 19. 14, 32. [n] ch. 19. 37. [o] ch. 26. 5. Deut. 12. 10. Ps. 4. 8. Prov. 1. 33. Jer. 23. 6.

[p] ch. 26. 5. Ezek. 34. 25, 27, 28. [q] Matt. 6. 25, 31. [r] ver. 4, 5. [s] Deut. 28. 8. See Exod. 16. 29. [t] 2 Kings 19. 29. [u] Josh. 5. 11, 12. [x] Deut. 32. 43. 2 Chron. 7. 20. Ps. 85. 1. Joel 2. 18, and 3. 2. [y] 1 Chron. 29. 15. Ps. 39. 12, and 119. 19. 1 Pet. 2. 11.

than he would have the poor man require more for it than its just value, computing to the time of the next jubilee. It seems to be a general injunction of equity, the particular application of which is shown in the verses immediately following.

15. *According to the number of years*, &c. The purchases that were to be made of lands were to be regulated by the number of years which remained to the next jubilee. This was something like buying the unexpired term of a lease among us; the purchase being always regulated by the number of years between the time of purchase and the expiration of the term. It is easy to perceive that the nearer the jubilee was, the less would be the value of the land; therefore it is said; 'According to the fewness of the years thou shalt diminish the price.'——¶ *According to the number of the years of the fruits.* They were to reckon only the productive years, and therefore must discount for the sabbatical years.

17. *Thou shalt fear thy God.* This would be the great guaranty for the strict observance of the foregoing precepts, as 'by the fear of the Lord men depart from iniquity.'

Promises to Obedience.

18. *Ye shall dwell in the land in safety.* Heb. לבטח *labeta'h, in confident-safety.* The Heb. word expresses both the *boldness* and *confidence* with which men that fear and obey God trust in him, and the *safety* and *security* which they feel in his protection in times of doubt or danger.

Law of Redemption of Land.

23. *The land shall not be sold for ever.* As the root of the original word here rendered 'for ever,' signifies *to cut entirely off*, the meaning in this case probably is that the land should not be sold in such a manner as to be *entirely cut off from redemption*; i. e. wholly and absolutely alienated from the hand of the proprietor. This was forbidden

24 And in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land.

25 ¶ [z] If thy brother be waxen poor, and hath sold away *some* of his possession, and if [a] any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that which his brother sold.

26 And if the man have none to redeem it, and himself be able to redeem it.

[z] Ruth 2. 20, and 4. 4, 6. [a] See Ruth 3. 2, 9. 12. Jer. 32. 7, 8.

27 Then [b] let him count the years of the sale thereof, and restore the overplus unto the man to whom he sold it; that he may return unto his possession.

28 But if he be not able to restore *it* to him, then that which is sold shall remain in the hand of him that hath bought it until the year of jubilee: [c] and in the jubilee it shall go out, and he shall return unto his possession.

[b] ver. 50, 51, 52. [c] ver. 13.

because as God, in a miraculous manner, gave them possession of this land, they were to consider themselves merely as *tenants* to him; and, therefore, he as the great landholder or lord of the soil, prescribes to them the conditions on which they shall hold it.

24. *Grant a redemption for the land.* That is, the privilege of redemption; so that he who sold it, if he became able, or his kinsman or relations in case he died, might redeem it in the interim before the next jubilee; but if it was not done before the year of jubilee, it was not then redeemed, but was restored gratis in virtue of the jubilee-law.

25. *If thy brother be waxen poor*, &c. We learn from Maimonides that it was seldom that houses or lands were sold among the Jews till the year of jubilee, except from the pressure of *poverty*. For purposes of gainful traffic it was almost never done. When want and distress were the prompting cause, provision was kindly made for their redemption.——¶ *If any of his kin come to redeem it.* Heb. 'The redeemer thereof, he that is near unto him, shall come and shall redeem.' The Heb. word for *redeem* (גאל *goël*), is the term applied to the *kinsman* to whom pertained the right, according to a very ancient usage, of redeeming lands, houses, or persons, and also of avenging the blood of one slain. The person sustaining this office was a lively figure of Christ, who, assumed our nature that he might become our *kinsman-redeemer*, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, and in reference to whom it is said, Is. 59. 20, 'The *redeemer* shall come out of Zion.' He has by his sufferings and death *bought back* to man that *inheritance* which had been forfeited by sin. ——¶ *That which his brother sold.* Heb. ממכר אחיו *mimkar a'hiv, the sale of his brother.*

26. *And himself be able to redeem it.* Heb. 'His hand hath attained unto, and he hath found the sufficiency of the redemption;' i. e. the requisite means of making the redemption. This is construed, however, by the Rabbinical writers to imply that he must have grown able from his own means to re-purchase the property, and that he was not to do it by borrowing.

27. *Then let him count*, &c. That is, let him count the years from the time the sale was made unto the next ensuing jubilee; computing the income for the years that remain, and paying for them at the original rate agreed upon at the time of sale. If, for instance, one sold a field to another ten years before a jubilee, and at the end of five years wished to redeem it, he paid the purchaser half the price at which he bought it; and so on in that proportion, according to the time. A fair estimate was to be made of the probable proceeds of the land during

29 And if a man sell a dwelling-house in a walled city, then he may redeem it within a whole year after it is sold: *within* a full year may he redeem it.

30 And if it be not redeemed within the space of a full year, then the house that *is* in the walled city shall be established for ever to him that bought it, throughout his generations: it shall not go out in the jubilee.

31 But the houses of the villages which have no walls round about them, shall be counted as the fields of the country: they may be redeemed, and they shall go out in the jubilee.

32 Notwithstanding [d] the cities of the Levites, *and* the houses of the cities of their possession, may the Levites redeem at any time.

33 And if a man purchase of the Levites, then the house that was sold, and the city of his possession [e] shall go out in *the year of* jubilee: for the houses of the cities of the Levites *are* their possession among the children of Israel.

34 But [f] the field of the suburbs of their cities may not be sold, for it *is* their perpetual possession.

35 ¶ And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee; then thou shalt [g] relieve him: *yea, though he be* a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee.

[d] See Numb. 35. 2. Josh. 21. 2, &c.

[e] ver. 28. [f] See Acts 4. 36, 37. [g] Deut. 15. 7, 8. Ps. 37. 26, and 41. 1, and 112. 5, 9. Prov. 14. 31. Luke 6. 35. Acts 11. 29. Rom. 12. 13. 1 John 3. 17.

the interval to the jubilee, and this was to be allowed to the buyer. This is termed 'restoring the overplus.'

The Difference in the terms of Redemption in respect to City and Country Houses.

29. *If a man sell a dwelling-house in a walled city.* Heb. עיר חומה *ir 'homah, a city of wall.* Houses in walled cities were more the fruit of their own industry than land in the country, which was the immediate gift of God; and, therefore, if a man sold a house in a city, he might redeem it any time within a year after the date, but otherwise it was confirmed to the purchaser for ever, and should no more return to the original proprietor, not even in the year of jubilee. This provision was made to encourage strangers and proselytes to come and settle among them. Though they could not purchase *land* in Canaan for themselves and their heirs, yet they might purchase *houses* in walled cities, which would be most convenient for them who were supposed to live by trade. But country villages could be disposed of no otherwise than as lands might.

Exception in favor of the Levites.

32. *Notwithstanding the cities of the Levites,* &c. This was doubtless because the Levites had no other possessions than the forty-eight cities with their suburbs which were assigned them, and God would show that the Levites were his peculiar care; and it was for the interest of the public that they should not be impoverished or deprived of their possessions. Therefore as their houses in these cities were the whole of what they could call *their own*, they could not be utterly alienated.

Compassion to be had of the Poor.

35. *Fallen in decay.* Heb. מטה ידו *mâtâh yâdo, his hand wavereth.* Gr. *ασθενησῃ ταις χερσιν αυτου, is weak in his hands.* That is, disabled from helping himself; one who was unable to help himself, as if his hand were shaking with the palsy.——¶ *Thou shalt relieve him.* Heb. והחזקת בו *he'hezakta bo, thou shalt strengthen him.* That is, thou shalt extend to him relief, which is otherwise expressed by *holding* or *strengthening the hands* of the weak and needy.——¶ *That he may live with*

36 [h] Take thou no usury of him, or increase; but [i] fear thy God; that thy brother may live with thee.

37 Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase.

38 [k] I *am* the LORD your God, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan, *and* to be your God.

39 ¶ And [l] if thy brother *that dwelleth* by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant:

40 *But* as an hired servant, *and* as a sojourner he shall be with thee, *and* shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee:

41 And *then* shall he depart from thee, *both* he and his children [m] with him, and shall return unto his own family, and [n] unto the possession of his fathers shall he return.

[h] Exod. 22. 25. Deut. 23. 19. Neh. 5. 7. Ps. 15. 5. Prov. 28. 8. Ezek. 18. 8, 13, 17, and 22. 12. [i] ver. 17. Neh. 5. 9. [k] ch. 22. 32, 33. [l] Exod. 21. 2. Deut. 15. 12. 1 Kings 9. 22. 2 Kings 4. 1. Neh. 5. 5. Jer. 34. 14.

[m] Exod. 21. 3. [n] ver. 28.

---

thee; i. e. that he may be enabled to recover himself out of his calamities and live prosperously among you. 'Life' in the Scriptures is often used in opposition to sickness, distress, calamity, as Isai. 38. 9, 'The writing of Hezekiah king of Judah, when he had been sick, and was *recovered*, (Heb. was made *alive*) of his sickness.' Neh. 4. 2, 'Will they *revive* (Heb. make *alive*) the stones out of the heaps of the rubbish which are burned?' 1 Chron. 11. 8, 'And Joab *repaired* (Heb. made *alive*) the rest of the city.' Gen. 45. 27, 'And the spirit of Jacob their father *revived*, (Heb. was made *alive*).'

36. *Take thou no usury of him.* The original term נֶשֶׁךְ *neshek* comes from the verb נָשַׁךְ *nashak, to bite*, mostly applied to the bite of a serpent, and properly signifies *biting usury*, so called perhaps because it resembles the bite of a serpent; for as this is often so small as to be scarcely perceptible at first, but the venom soon spreads and diffuses itself, till it reaches the vitals, so the *increase of usury*, which at first is not perceived, at length grows so much as to devour a man's substance. As this law was ordained merely to prevent cruel exactions, it cannot be considered as applying to that reasonable compensation for the use of money which is known among us by the appellation of *simple interest*. See Note on Ex. 22. 25.

An Israelite not to be obliged to serve as a Slave.

39. *And be sold unto thee.* Persons were sometimes sold among the Jews by judicial process when they had been guilty of theft, and were not able to make satisfaction, Ex. 21. 2. Some were sold by their parents; i. e. they disposed of their *right of service* for a stipulated sum, and for a number of years. Others, again, when reduced to extreme want, sold themselves, as we have explained more at large, Ex. 21. 2. The Jewish writers inform us that this was not considered lawful except in extreme cases. 'A man might not sell himself to lay up the money which was given for him; nor to buy goods; nor to pay his debts, but merely that he might get bread to eat. Neither was it lawful for him to sell himself as long as he had so much as a garment left.'—*Maimonides.*——¶ *Thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond servant.* That is, it must not be supposed that his master that bought him had as absolute a property in him as in a captive taken in war, who might be used, sold, and bequeathed, at pleasure, as much as a man's cattle; but he shall serve thee merely as a *hired servant* whose set-

42 For they *are* [o]my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bond-men.

43 [p]Thou shalt not rule over him [q]with rigour, but [r]shalt fear thy God.

44 Both thy bond-men and thy bond-maids, which thou shalt have, *shall be* of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bond-men and bond-maids.

[o] ver. 55. Rom. 6. 22. 1 Cor. 7. 23. [p] Ephes. 6. 9. Col. 4. 1. [q] ver. 46. Exod. 1. 13. [r] ver. 17. Exod. 1. 17, 21. Deut. 25. 18. Mal. 3. 5.

45 Moreover, of [s]the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that *are* with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession.

46 And [t]ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit *them for* a possession, they shall be your bond-men for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, [u]ye shall not rule one over another with rigour.

[s] Isai. 56. 3, 6. [t] Isai. 14. 2. [u] ver. 43.

vices the master may command, without pretending to a despotic power over his person.

42. *They shall not be sold as bond-men.* That is, not in the open public manner that other servants or slaves were sold; not, as it were, in the market place; but privately and in a more honorable way. But the spirit of the passage, as connected with the next verse, seems to be, that he should not be taken as a mere slave, but as a hired servant, or as a brother fallen into adversity, and treated as an Israelite fearing God would desire a brother Israelite to treat himself in the same circumstances.

43. *Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor.* Heb. בפרך *bepharek, with fierceness.* See the term explained in the Note on Ex. 1. 13, where it is applied to the cruelty of Pharaoh's task masters. Gr. 'Thou shalt not rack nor afflict them with labors.' But though forbidden thus to tyrannise over their own countrymen, were they permitted to treat their heathen bondmen with rigor? On this the Hebrew writers say, 'It is lawful to make a Canaanitish servant serve with rigor, but notwithstanding this right, it is the property of mercy and way of wisdom that a man should be compassionate, and follow justice, and not make his yoke heavy upon his servant nor afflict him.' 'Labor beyond the person's strength, or labor too long continued, or in unhealthy or uncomfortable places and circumstances, or without sufficient food, &c. is labor exacted with rigor, and consequently inhuman, and so at variance not only with the spirit of the Mosaic dispensation, but with the maxims of right conduct among every people under heaven.'—*A. Clarke.*

44. *Shall be of the heathen that are round about you.* That is, of the heathen inhabiting the countries round about the Holy Land, but not of the Canaanites, whom they were required to destroy.——¶ *Of them shall ye buy bond-men and bond-maids.* Heb. תקנו *tiknu, shall ye obtain, acquire,* whether by purchase or otherwise. We have already observed, in the full explanation of this term, Ex. 21. 2, that its general import is that of *acquisition,* without specifying the mode. It is not improbable that heathen bond-men were occasionally *bought* by the Israelites, but the precept has doubtless a primary reference to such as were taken captives in war; whence the Latin name *mancipia* is supposed to be equivalent to *manu capti, captured by the hand,* and *servus, slave,* to be applied to one who was *preserved* alive when he might otherwise have been killed. The rule permitted them also to obtain by purchase the children of resident foreign

47 ¶ And if a sojourner or a stranger wax rich by thee, and [x] thy brother *that dwelleth* by him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger *or* sojourner by thee, or to the stock of the stranger's family:

48 After that he is sold he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren may [y] redeem him:

49 Either his uncle, or his uncle's son may redeem him, or *any* that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem him; or if [z] he be able, he may redeem himself.

50 And he shall reckon with him that bought him, from the year that he was sold to him, unto the year of jubilee: and the price of his sale shall be according unto the number of years, [a] according to the time of an hired servant shall it be with him.

51 If *there be* yet many years *behind*, according unto them he shall give again the price of his redemp-

[x] ver. 25. 35. [y] Neh. 5. 5. [z] ver. 26.

[a] Job 7. 1. Isai. 16. 14, and 21. 16.

ers among them, who, though they might be proselytes of the gate, yet were not circumcised; and whom the Chal. therefore denominates 'uncircumcised sojourners.'

Of the Redemption of the Israelitish Bond-man from the hand of the Sojourner.

47. *Sell himself unto the stranger.* It will be well, in reference to the laws concerning slavery in this chapter, to recollect that Moses is not *originating* laws to give a sanction to slavery, but is interposing, under the divine command, to regulate for the better a system already in operation. We discover the existence of slavery in the book of Genesis, and are aware of its early prevalence in all countries. Those who are acquainted with the condition of slaves in ancient nations will not fail to recognise the wisdom and mercy of the various regulations on the subject which are given here and elsewhere, and which, when carefully considered, will be found in all instances to have an obvious tendency to protect a bond-man, and to ameliorate his condition, whether a native or a foreigner. The law of the present chapter is so clearly announced as to require no particular exposition. On the above-cited verse we may however observe, that foreigners among the Jews seem to have been in a much more privileged condition than they are at present in the same or any Mohammedan country. We see that a resident foreigner is allowed to purchase any Hebrew whose distressed circumstances make him wish to sell his liberty. At present no Christian or Jew in a Mohammedan country is allowed to have as a slave, we will not say any native, but any Mohammedan of any country—nor, indeed, any other than Mohammedans, except negroes—who are the only description of slaves they may possess.'—*Pict. Bib.*

50. *And he shall reckon*, &c. In order that no injustice might be done to the master, they were to compute how long the bond-man had served him, how long he had still to serve, and what price was paid for him; and then, according to the number of years elapsed, and the number to come, the right sum was made out. The Jews held, that the kindred of such a person were bound, if in their power, to redeem him, lest he should be swallowed up among the heathen; and we find from Neh. 5. 8, that this was done by the Jews on their return from the Babylonish captivity; 'We, after our ability, have redeemed our brethren the Jews, who were sold unto the heathen.'——¶ *According to the time of a hired servant shall it be with him.* That is, according to the rate of wages ordinarily allowed to a hired servant for the like period of time shall the sum paid for him be estimated.

tion out of the money that he was bought for.

52 And if there remain but few years unto the year of jubilee, then he shall count with him, *and* according unto his years shall he give him again the price of his redemption.

53 *And* as a yearly hired servant shall he be with him: *and the other* shall not rule with rigour over him in thy sight.

54 And if he be not redeemed in these *years*, then [b] he shall go out in the year of jubilee, *both* he, and his children with him.

55 For [c] unto me the children of Israel *are* servants, they *are* my servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: I *am* the LORD your God.

[b] ver. 41. Exod. 21. 2, 3.

53. *Shalt not rule with rigor over him in thy sight.* That is, with thy connivance. Thou, an Israelite, shalt not knowingly suffer a stranger to maltreat or abuse one of their own brethren. It shall be the duty of the magistrates, upon information, to call such an one to account.

54. *If he be not redeemed in those years.* Heb. באלה *beëlleh, in or by these.* As there is no substantive in the original, it is somewhat doubtful what word is to be supplied. The Gr. has *κατα ταυτα, by these things or means*, i. e. neither by himself or others before the jubilee.

55. *For unto me the children of Israel are servants.* The original term is the same that has hitherto all along been rendered 'bond-men;' and the force of the intended contrast would have been stronger, had that word been retained. Let the children of Israel be dealt with as I have commanded, for they are *my* bond-men in a far higher sense than they are or can be those of any other.

CHAPTER XXVI.

The present chapter may be said to be a solemn practical conclusion to the main body of the Levitical law, containing a general enforcement of all its precepts by promises of reward in case of obedience on the one hand, and threatenings of punishment in case of disobedience on the other.

CHAPTER XXVI.

YE shall make you [a] no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up *any* image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it: for I *am* the LORD your God.

[c] ver. 42. [a] Exod. 20. 4, 5. Deut. 5. 8, and 16. 22, and 27. 15. Ps. 97. 7.

Idolatry forbidden.

1. *Ye shall make you no idols.* Heb. אלילם *elelim, nothings, vanities.* Gr. *χειροποιητα, things made with hands.* It is a term expressive of the utmost possible contempt towards the objects intended, and the prohibition comes in very properly in this place, at the head of these solemn injunctions, idolatry being the grand crowning sin which they were most studiously to avoid. For a farther explication of the word, see on Lev. 19. 4.——¶ *Nor graven image.* Heb. פסל *pesel*, i. e. any thing *hewed* or *sculptured* out of wood or stone. See Note on on Ex. 20. 4.——¶ *Standing image.* Heb. מצבה *matzebûh, pillar or statue;* i. e. either a single stone, or a pile of stones reared and consecrated to religious purposes. Probably the stones or pillars which were at first set up and *anointed* by holy men in commemoration of signal interpositions of God in their behalf, were afterwards abused to idolatrous and superstitious purposes, and therefore are forbidden.——¶ *Image of stone.* Heb אבן משכית *eben maskith, stone of imagery*, or *stone of picture or figure*, i. e. stones curiously wrought and

2 ¶ [b] Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I *am* the LORD.

[b] ch. 19. 30.

carved with figures in relief, which were often made use of as objects of adoration among the ancient heathen. Chal. 'Stone of worship.' 'In Ezek. 8. 8-11, there is a description of a subterraneous vault, the walls of which were covered with images of quadrupeds and creeping things, exactly like those of Egypt which are covered with hieroglyphic figures. In the 12th verse this vault is called חדר משכית *hadar maskith*, which our translation excellently renders 'chambers of imagery.' Now the same word being used in two places with an analogous context, it is fair to infer, that if an hieroglyphic cave is intended in Ezekiel, an hieroglyphic stone is intended here; which is the more probable when we recollect that the Israelites were at this time fresh from Egypt, and deeply infected with the rank idolatries of that country—insomuch that whenever Moses interdicts, at this early period, a particular form of idolatry, we should invariably feel disposed to look to Egypt, in the first instance, for the example. It is well known that the Egyptian priests, in order to preserve the treasures of knowledge and their discoveries in natural science, and at the same time to render them inscrutable to any but the initiated few, made use not of common writing but of hieroglyphics, with which they inscribed obelisks, walls, and even subterraneous chambers and galleries, as well as square stones. These monuments were deified by the multitude, who worshipped in them Thoth, the Egyptian god of learning. This was a sufficient reason for their interdiction by Moses. But had he no further reason? As this law, if it be thus rightly understood, would operate to the exclusion of hieroglyphics, are we not at liberty to infer that Moses—or rather his Divine instructor—thus expressed his abhorrence of a practice which locked up knowledge to the people for the purpose of enabling the privileged few, by virtue of that power which knowledge gives, to hold in entire thraldom their minds, bodies, and estates? Michaelis, whose view of this text we have followed, well observes; 'Had Moses been only a wise and benevolent impostor; had he given himself out for a divine messenger, without being so, and merely from love to an oppressed people; and had his miracles been nothing more than human devices; it is scarcely conceivable how he could ever have gone the length of abolishing an expedient so artfully contrived, and so favorable to the views of priestcraft, for the concealment of the sciences. The legislator, therefore, who relinquished such an expedient, and at the same time founded his polity on the commandments of a Deity, could be no impostor, but must have been an honest man.'—*Pict. Bib.*

3 ¶ [c] If ye walk in my statutes

[c] Deut. 11. 13, 14, 15, and 28. 1-14.

The Sabbath and the Sanctuary to be Sanctified.

2. *Ye shall keep my sabbaths.* That is, my different days of sabbatical rest; not only the sabbath day, but other stated solemnities, which were to be distinguished by holy convocations. Next in importance to the charge concerning idolatry is that respecting the due observance of the sabbath; and we accordingly find in the prophets, that next to that of idolatry, there is no sin for which the Jews are more frequently reproved and threatened, than the profanation of God's holy sabbaths. The reverence of the sanctuary here enjoined is connected with the keeping of the Sabbath by a tie of intimacy too obvious to need remark.

Promises to Obedience.

3. *If ye walk in my statutes,* &c.

and keep my commandments, and do them;

4 [d]Then I will give you rain in due season, [e]and the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit:

5 And [f]your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing-time; and [g]ye shall eat your bread to the full, and [h]dwell in your land safely.

[d] Isai. 30. 23. Ezek. 34. 26. Joel 2. 23, 24. [e] Ps. 67. 6, and 85. 12. Ezek. 34. 27, and 36. 30. Zech. 8. 12. [f] Amos 9. 13. [g] ch. 25. 19. Deut. 11. 15. Joel 2. 19, 26. [h] ch. 25. 18. Job 11. 18. Ezek. 34. 25, 27, 28. [i] 1 Chron. 22. 9. Ps. 29. 11, and 147. 14. Isai. 45. 7. Hag. 2. 9.

6 And [i]I will give peace in the land, and [k]ye shall lie down, and none shall make *you* afraid: and I will rid [l]evil beasts out of the land, neither shall [m]the sword go through your land.

7 And ye shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword.

8 And [n]five of you shall chase an hundred, and an hundred of you shall put ten thousand to flight: and your enemies shall fall before you by the sword.

[k] Job 11. 19. Ps. 3. 5, and 4. 8. Isai. 35. 9. Jer. 30. 10. Ezek. 34. 25. Hos. 2. 18. Zeph. 3. 13. [l] 2 Kings 17. 25. Ezek. 5. 17, and 14. 15. [m] Ezek. 14. 17. [n] Deut. 32. 30. Josh. 23. 10.

The promises and threatenings which follow are of a temporal nature; and it has been questioned whether they extend to individuals, or are to be limited to the Israelites as a nation. But the happiness and prosperity of a nation necessarily involves that of individuals; and though individuals might not be uniformly rewarded or punished according to their obedience or disobedience, yet the temporal retribution announced was sufficiently uniform to evince the particular providence which guided the people of Israel.

4. *Then will I give you rain.* Heb. נתתי גשמיכם *nathatti gishmĕkem, will give your rains.* So certain should be their showers in their seasons, so infallibly secured by promise, that they should be entitled to consider and call them *theirs;* 'I will give *your* rains.'

5. *Your threshing shall reach unto the vintage.* That is, so abundant shall be your corn-crops that the business of threshing shall not be completed before the vintage; and again, so plentiful shall be the produce of the vine, that ye shall not be able to finish the gathering and pressing of your grapes till sowing time again arrives. We meet with a similar sentiment in the prophet Amos, ch. 9, 13, 'The plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him who soweth seed.'

6. *I will give peace in your land.* Freedom from intestine commotions and insurrections, which often arise from poverty and discontent. The language seems rather to refer to peace among themselves, while the 'sword in the latter clause of the verse points rather to the ravages of war from foreign invasion. The blessings here promised, it will be noticed, are set in contrast with the main judgments which are elsewhere denounced against the Israelites, Ezek. 14. 21, to wit, famine, war, and evil beasts. See also Note on v. 21.

7. *Ye shall chase your enemies,* &c. That is, a few, a mere handful, shall be more than a match for a great multitude, as it proved in the conquest of Canaan; insomuch that Joshua says, enlarging upon this promise, Josh. 23. 10, 'One man of you shall chase a thousand.' This was signally fulfilled in the days of Gideon who with three men put to flight a vast army, Judg. 7. 22. So also in the case of David's worthies, of whom one lifted his spear against eight hundred, and slew three hundred at one time, 2 Sam. 23. 8, 18, I Chron. 11. 11. Three men also broke through

9 For I will [o] have respect unto you, and [p] make you fruitful, and multiply you, and establish my covenant with you.

10 And ye shall eat [q] old store, and bring forth the old because of the new.

11 [r] And I will set my tabernacle among you: and my soul shall not [s] abhor you.

12 [t] And I will walk among you, and [u] will be your God, and ye shall be my people.

13 [w] I *am* the LORD your God, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, that ye should not be their bond-men, [x] and I have broken the bands of your yoke, and made you go upright.

[o] Exod. 2. 25. 2 Kings 13. 23. [p] Gen. 17. 6, 7. Neh. 9. 23. Ps. 107. 38. [q] ch. 25. 32. [r] Exod. 25. 8, and 29. 45. Josh. 22. 19. Ps. 76. 2. Ezek. 37. 26, 27, 28. Rev. 21. 3. [s] ch. 20. 23. Deut. 32. 19.

[t] 2 Cor. 6. 16. [u] Exod. 6. 7. Jer. 7. 23, and 11. 4, and 30. 22. Ezek. 11. 20, and 36. 28. [w] ch. 25. 38, 42, 55. [x] Jer. 2. 20 Ezek. 34. 27.

---

the host of the Philistines, 1 Chron. 11. 18. Comp. Deut. 32. 30.

9. *For I will have respect unto you.* Heb. פניתי אליכם *panithi alëkem, I will turn my face unto you.* Gr. επιβλεψω εφ' 'υμας και αυξανω 'υμας, *I will look upon you and bless you.* Chal. 'I will have respect by my Word to do good unto you.' For this favor David prays, Ps. 25. 16, and 69. 17, and when God had delivered Israel from their enemies, it is said, 2 Kings 13. 23, 'The Lord was gracious unto them, and *had respect unto them*, because of his covenant.'——¶ *Establish my covenant with you.* That is, inviolably keep my covenant already established, and faithfully perform its every stipulation.

10. *Ye shall eat old store*, &c. That is, to prevent waste from superabundance, ye shall eat of your old stock of provisions, notwithstanding the new crop has come in.——¶ *Bring forth the old because of the new.* That is, ye shall be forced to 'bring forth,' or remove from your barns and garners, the old stock of your corn, in order to make room for the new.

11. *And I will set my tabernacle among you.* That is, I will firmly and permanently establish my tabernacle among you; I will secure its continuance with you. In addition to this, its primary sense, the passage contains in effect the grand promise of the Gospel dispensation, viz.: the presence, manifestation, and in-dwelling of God in human nature. So John 1. 14, 'The Word was made flesh and *dwelt* among us. Gr. '*Tabernacled* among us.' Jesus Christ was the true tabernacle of God, and though this promise was in an eminent manner fulfilled in the Savior's inhabitation of our nature while accomplishing his work on earth, yet it appears from Rev. 21. 3, that we are to look for its fulfilment in a still higher sense at some future period of this world's history: 'And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them.' See Note on Ex. 29. 45, where this promise is largely considered.——¶ *My soul shall not abhor you.* I will regard you with tokens of the utmost complacency; I will take delight in you, and impart the inward peace of my spirit. The contrary of this is threatened, v. 30.

12. *And I will walk among you.* Chal. 'I will cause my Shekinah to dwell among you.' I will be familiarly conversant among you by the visible symbol of my presence, conducting your journeys in the wilderness, and abiding in the tabernacle and temple prepared for me.

13. *And made you go upright.* That is, set you free from bondage; brought you into that state of enlargement in which you are no more bowed down by

14 ¶ [y] But if you will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments;

15 And if ye shall [z] despise my statutes, or if your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, *but* that ye break my covenant:

16 I also will do this unto you, I will even appoint over you [a] terror, [b] consumption, and the burning ague, that shall [c] consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and [d] ye shall sow your seed in vain: for your enemies shall eat it.

17 And [e] I will set my face against you, and [f] ye shall be slain before your enemies; [g] they that hate you shall reign over you, and [h] ye shall flee when none pursueth you.

18 And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you [i] seven times more for your sins.

19 And I will [k] break the pride of your power; and I [l] will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass:

20 And your [m] strength shall be

[y] Deut. 28. 15. Lam. 2. 17. Mal. 2. 2. [z] ver. 43. 2 Kings 17. 15. [a] Deut. 28. 65, 66, 67, and 32. 25. Jer. 15. 8. [b] Deut. 28. 22. [c] 1 Sam. 2. 33. [d] Deut. 28. 33, 51. Job 31. 8. Jer. 5. 17, and 12. 13. Mic. 6. 15.

[e] ch. 17. 10. [f] Deut. 28. 25. Judg. 2. 14. Jer. 19. 7. [g] Ps. 106. 41. [h] ver. 36. Ps. 53. 5. Prov. 28. 1. [i] 1 Sam. 2. 5. Ps. 119. 164. Prov. 24. 16. [k] Isai. 25. 11, and 26. 5. Ezek. 7. 24, and 30. 6. [l] Deut. 28. 23. [m] Ps. 127. 1. Isai. 49. 4.

---

the heavy burdens laid upon your backs, nor hanging down your heads in despondency and woe.

Threatenings denounced against Disobedience.

14. *If ye will not hearken to me.* Gr. *εαν δε μη υπακουσητε μου, if ye will not obey me.* This is one of the most frequent uses of the original word for 'hear' or 'hearken.' Chal. 'If ye will not receive my word.' So in v. 18. The subsequent history of the Jewish race affords the most conclusive evidence that these predictions were fulfilled with a fearful exactness. The limits of our annotations do not permit us to go into minute detail, but the volumes of Newton and Keith will present a mass of proof on this score which will be found to be of intense interest, and such as the most determined skeptic will endeavor in vain to gainsay.

16. *I will even appoint over you terror,* &c. Heb. הפקדתי עליכם *hiphkadti alëkem, will visit upon you.* At the same time, there is very good authority for interpreting the verb as is done in our translation, in the sense of *setting over, constituting guardians of, investing with authority.* The true force of the term in this form is *to cause to preside over,* and Ps. 109. 6, affords a strikingly parallel example; 'Set *thou* a wicked man *over* him (הפקד *haphkëd*), &c.' The language thus construed is singularly bold and striking. Terror, consumption, and the burning ague are personified, and made the keepers of the disobedient and apostate Israelites. They haunt their steps wherever they go, and keep them continually under the influence of dismay, feeling indiscribable evils, and fearing worse.

18. *Then will I punish you seven times more for your sins.* A definite for an indefinite number, according to common usage. The import is plainly that of a great increase of their plagues. These, by reason of their continued provocations, were to become more and more aggravated from age to age, as history proves to have been the case. The words contain no allusion to a period of time, but simply to the degree of their punishment.

19. *I will make your heaven as iron and your earth as brass.* That is, that part of the heavens which is over your country shall afford no more rain than if it were a canopy of iron, and consequently your earth or land shall be as

spent in vain: for [n] your land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits.

21 ¶ And if ye walk contrary unto me, and will not hearken unto me, I will bring seven times more plagues upon you according to your sins.

22 [o] I will also send wild beasts among you, which shall rob you of your children, and destroy your cattle, and make you few in number, and [p] your *high*-ways shall be desolate.

23 And if ye [q] will not be reformed by me by these things, but will walk contrary unto me;

24 [r] Then will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you yet seven times for your sins.

25 And [s] I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of *my* covenant: and when ye are gathered together within your cities, [t] I will send the pestilence among you: and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy.

26 [u] *And* when I have broken the staff of your bread, ten women shall bake your bread in one oven, and

[n] Deut. 11. 17, and 28. 18. Hag. 1. 10. [o] Deut. 32. 24. 2 Kings 17. 25. Ezek. 5. 17, and 14. 15. [p] Judg. 5. 6. 2 Chron. 15. 5. Isai. 33. 8. Lam. 1. 4, Zech. 7. 14. [q] Jer. 2. 30, and 5. 3. Amos 4. 6-12.

[r] 2 Sam. 22. 27. Ps. 18. 26. [s] Ezek. 5. 17, and 6. 3, and 14. 17, and 29. 8, and 33. 2. [t] Numb. 14. 12. Deut. 28. 21. Jer. 14. 12, and 24. 10, and 29. 17, 18. Amos 4. 10. [u] Ps. 105. 16. Isai. 3. 1. Ezek. 4. 16, and 5. 16, and 14. 13.

---

barren of fruit as though the soil were brass.

21. *If ye walk contrary unto me.* Heb. קרי *keri*, a term of doubtful import, as appears from the marginal reading of our version, 'at all adventures with me;' i. e. heedlessly, indifferently, reckless of consequences. This sense is adopted by the Hebrew writers, though the Gr. and the Chal. give that of 'contrariety,' and Gesenius and other lexicographers define it by 'hostile encounter,' or 'going counter' to any one.

22. *I will send wild beasts among you.* A reference to the following passages will show the literal fulfilment, in repeated instances, of this prediction: 1 Kings 13. 24,—20. 36. 2 Kings 2. 24,—17. 25, 26. Comp. Jer. 2. 15,—4. 7,—8. 17,—15. 3,—Ezek. 5. 17.——¶ *Your high-ways shall be desolate.* For the truth of this see Judg. 5. 6, 2 Chron. 15. 5, Is. 33. 8.

24. *Will punish you yet seven times for your sins.* With seven-fold greater severity.

25. *That shall avenge the quarrel of my covenant.* That shall execute vengeance for the violation of my covenant. Chal. 'That shall avenge on you the vengeance for that ye have transgressed against the words of the law.' So in Jer. 50. 28, mention is made of the 'vengeance of the Lord's temple,' by which is meant the punishment of the Babylonians for robbing and burning the temple.——¶ *I will send the pestilence among you.* Gr. θανατος, *the death.* Chal. *id.* See Note on Ex. 5. 3. It implies the cutting off by death of man and beast. See Ezek. 14. 19, 21.

26. *Ten women shall bake your bread in one oven.* That is, there shall be such a scarcity of bread that one ordinary oven shall answer for the baking of ten, that is a great many families, whereas in common circumstances one oven would serve for one family. The editor of the Pict. Bible gives somewhat of a different turn to the expression. 'In the note to chap. 2. 4, we remarked that in the East it was a general custom for families to bake their own bread in the sort of ovens which we there described. The performance of this duty always falls to the lot of the women. These ovens are, as we have seen, small, and only suited to the

they shall deliver *you* your bread again by weight: and [x] ye shall eat and not be satisfied.

27 And [y] if ye will not for all this hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me;

28 Then I will walk contrary unto you also [z] in fury; and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins.

[x] Isai. 9. 20. Mic. 6. 14. Hag. 1. 6. [y] ver. 21, 24. [z] Isai. 59. 18, and 63. 3, and 66. 15. Jer. 21. 5. Ezek. 5. 13, 15, and 8. 18.

29 [a] And ye shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters shall ye eat.

30 And [b] I will destroy your high places, and cut down your images, and [c] cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols, and my soul shall [d] abhor you.

[a] Deut. 28. 53. 2 Kings 6. 29. Ezek. 5. 10. Lam. 4. 10. [b] 2 Chron. 34. 3, 4, 7. Isai. 27. 9. Ezek. 6. 3, 4, 5, 6, 13. [c] 2 Kings 23. 20. 2 Chron. 34. 5. [d] Lev. 20. 23. Ps. 78. 59, and 89. 38. Jer. 14. 19.

use of one family; but it is by no means impossible to bake at one of them an adequate supply of bread for ten families, although, of course, the process would consume time. We therefore do not, with most expositors, understand scarcity to be implied in the simple fact that ten families baked their bread in an oven for one; but that ten families, represented by their females, clubbed their dough together, and the produce being no more than an ordinary supply for *one* family, it was baked in one oven, instead of each family, as usual, making a separate baking. Afterwards, the cakes thus baked were proportioned by weight to the respective contributors —so precious was the bread. This is implied in the words, 'shall deliver you *your* bread *again* by weight;' which shows that the bread was previously theirs, and had been baked for them, not that it was *sold* to them by weight.'——¶ *Shall deliver you your bread again by weight.* No language could be more expressive of the extremities to which they should be reduced. As the survivors of a shipwreck, who put to sea in an open boat, are often reduced to the most stinted allowance, and have a small quantity of food and drink served out to them by weight and measure, so should it be in the extremity of famine to which the Israelites should be brought by their disobedience. In allusion to this it is threatened again, Ezek. 4. 16, 17, 'I will break the staff of bread in Jerusalem, and they shall eat bread by weight, and with care, and they shall drink water by measure, and with astonishment; that they may want bread and water, and be astonied one with another, and consume away for their iniquity.'

29. *Ye shall eat the flesh of your sons,* &c. This was literally fulfilled at the siege of Samaria, 2 Kings 6. 29, in the days of Jehoram, and also in that of Jerusalem, under Titus. Josephus, J. W. B. 7, c. 2, gives an instance in dreadful detail, of a woman named Mary, who in the height of the famine, during the siege, killed her infant child, roasted, and had eaten part of it when discovered by the soldiers.' The fearful accomplishment of the threatened punishment is thus bewailed by Jeremiah, Lam. 4. 10, 'The hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children; they were their meat in the destruction of the daughter of my people.'

30. *I will destroy your high places.* What those were is not agreed, but probably they were raised places, artificial eminences, upon which they were wont to worship their idols. The word rendered 'images' clearly denotes some species of idol, though of what particular kind is doubtful. Comp. 2 Chron. 34. 7. The probability is that they were some kind of idolatrous fabrication, dedicated to the sun.——¶ *And cast your carcasses upor the carcasses*

31 [e] And I will make your cities waste, and [f] bring your sanctuaries unto desolation, and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours.

[e] Neh. 2. 3. Jer. 4. 7. Ezek. 6. 6. [f] Ps. 74. 7. Lam. 1. 10. Ezek. 9. 6, and 21. 7.

32 [g] And I will bring the land into desolation: and your enemies which dwell therein, shall be [h] astonished at it.

[g] Jer. 9. 11, and 25. 11. 18. [h] Deut. 28. 37. 1 Kings 9. 8. Jer. 18. 16, and 19. 8. Ezek. 5. 15.

of your idols. They shall be denied a seemly burial or a quiet repose in their graves. Thus Ezek. 6. 4, 5, 13, 'I will cast down your slain men before your idols; and I will lay the dead carcasses of the children of Israel before their idols; and I will scatter your bones round about your altars.' Comp. 2 Kings 23. 20. 2 Chron. 34. 5.

31. *I will make your cities waste.* The fulfilment of this minatory prediction has been so signal, that we cannot refrain from inserting from Keith the following graphic illustration of its effects. 'By the concurring testimony of all travellers, Judea may now be called a field of ruins. Columns, the memorials of ancient magnificence, now covered with rubbish, and buried under ruins, may be found in all Syria. From Mount Tabor is beheld an immensity of plains, interspersed with hamlets, fortresses, and heaps of ruins. Of the celebrated cities Capernaum, Bethsaida, Gadara, Tarichea, and Chorazin, nothing remains but shapeless ruins. Some vestiges of Emmaus may still be seen. Cana is a very paltry village. The ruins of Tekoa present only the foundations of some considerable buildings. The city of Nain is now a hamlet. The ruins of the ancient Sapphura announce the previous existence of a large city, and its name is still preserved in the appellation of a miserable village called Sephoury. Loudd, the ancient Lydda and Diospolis, appears like a place lately ravaged by fire and sword, and is one continued heap of rubbish and ruins. Ramla, the ancient Arimathea, is in almost as ruinous a state. Nothing but rubbish is to be found within its boundaries. In the adjacent country there are found at every step dry wells, cisterns fallen in, and vast vaulted reservoirs, which prove that in ancient times this town must have been upwards of a league and a half in circumference. Cæsarea can no longer excite the envy of a conqueror, and has long been abandoned to silent desolation. The city of Tiberias is now almost abandoned; and its subsistence precarious; of the towns that bordered on its lake there are no traces left. Zabulon, once the rival of Tyre and Sidon, is a heap of ruins. A few shapeless stones, unworthy the attention of the traveller, mark the site of the Saffre. The ruins of Jericho, covering no less than a square mile, are surrounded with complete desolation; and there is not a tree of any description, either of palm or balsam, and scarcely any verdure or bushes to be seen about the site of this abandoned city. Bethel is not to be found. The ruins of Sarepta, and of several large cities in its vicinity, are now 'mere rubbish, and are only distinguishable as the sites of towns by heaps of dilapidated stones and fragments of columns.' How marvellously are the predictions of their desolation verified, when in general nothing but ruined ruins form the most distinguished remnants of the cities of Israel; and when the multitude of its towns are almost all left, with many a vestige to testify of their number, but without a mark to tell their name.'——¶ *And bring your sanctuaries unto desolation.* As they had, properly speaking, but one sanctuary, the term here is undoubtedly used in a large sense including the tabernacle, the temple, and the various synagogues scattered over the land.

33 And [i] I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you, and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste.

34 [k] Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth desolate, and ye *be* in your enemies' land; *even* then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths.

35 As long as it lieth desolate it shall rest; because it did not rest in your [l] sabbaths, when ye dwelt upon it.

36 And upon them that are left *alive* of you, [m] I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies; and [n] the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee, as fleeing from a sword; and they shall fall, when none pursueth.

37 And [o] they shall fall one upon another, as it were before a sword, when none pursueth: and [p] ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies.

38 And ye shall perish among the heathen, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up.

39 And they that are left of you [q] shall pine away in their iniquity in your enemies' lands; and also in the iniquities of their fathers shall they pine away with them.

40 [r] If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which

[i] Deut. 4. 27, and 28. 64. Ps. 44. 11. Jer. 9. 16. Ezek. 12. 15, and 20. 23, and 22. 15. Zech. 7. 14. [k] 2 Chron. 36. 21. [l] ch. 25. 2. [m] Ezek. 21. 7, 12, 15. [n] ver. 17. Job. 15. 21. Prov. 28. 1.

[o] Isai. 10. 4. See Judg. 7. 22. 1 Sam. 14, 15, 16. [p] Josh. 7. 12, 13. Judg. 2. 14. [q] Deut. 4. 27, and 28. 65. Neh. 1. 9. Jer. 3. 25, and 29. 12, 13. Ezek. 4. 17, and 6. 9, and 20. 43, and 24. 23, and 33. 10, and 36. 31. Hos. 5. 15. Zech. 10. 9. [r] Numb. 5. 7. 1 Kings 8. 33, 35, 47. Neh. 9. 2. Dan. 9. 3, 4. Prov. 28. 13. Luke 15. 18. 1 John 1. 9.

33. *I will scatter you among the heathen.* Heb. אזרה *ezrah, I will fan or winnow you.* The term properly implies that kind of scattering which is the effect of winnowing grain, where the chaff is carried away by the wind. Comp. a similar use of the word, Ps. 44. 12, Zech. 7. 14

34. *Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths as long as it lieth desolate.* This is shown by Houbigant to have proved to be a historical fact. From Saul to the Babylonish captivity are numbered about 490 years, during which period there were of course 70 sabbaths of years. Now the Babylonish captivity lasted 70 years, and during that time the land of Israel rested. Therefore the land rested just as many years in the Babylonish captivity, as it should have rested sabbaths, if the Jews had observed the law relative to the sabbatic years.

39. *They that are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity.* The most obvious import of 'pining away in iniquity' is, to consume and perish in the punishment for iniquity; in allusion to which it is said, Ezek. 33. 10, 'If our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we *pine away in them*, how should we then live?' Comp. Ezek. 24. 23. Ainsworth suggests that it may likewise imply the beginning of grace, or a godly contrition in them that are left, i. e. 'the remnant, according to the election of grace,' Rom. 11. 5, who by their sore chastisements are brought to an humbling consciousness of their sins, and made to *feel* that they are pining away in them; or as is expressed by the prophet, Ezek. 36. 31, 'Ye shall loathe yourselves in your own sight for your iniquities.'

Promises of restored Favor upon Repentance.

40. *If they shall confess their iniquity,* &c. The portion contained between this verse and the end, may be considered as the third general division of the chapter, comprising a series of gracious

they trespassed against me, and that also they have walked contrary unto me;

41 And *that* I also have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their [s] uncircumcised hearts be [t] humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity:

[s] See Jer. 6. 10, and 9. 25, 26. Ezek. 44. 7. Acts 7. 51. Rom. 2. 29. Col. 2. 11. [t] 1 Kings 21. 29. 2 Chron. 12. 6, 7, 12, and 32. 26, and 33. 12, 13.

assurances of returning favor, upon their humble and sincere repentance. It declares that if, even in their worst and lowest state, they should penitently confess their iniquities, and acknowledge the mighty mind of God in their afflictions, and should meekly accept them as the punishment of their sins, then the Lord would again remember his covenant with their fathers, and restore to them his favor. The history of the nation, followed out in its details, confirms the truth of these promises no less clearly than it does of the threatenings recorded above. Never did Israel repent and seek the face of their God in vain. Whenever they returned to him in penitence and prayer, putting away their idols and renewing their obedience, he returned also to them in the various tokens of his mercy, delivering them from their enemies, restoring to them the years which the canker-worm had eaten, and blessing them with peace and plenty. A most striking specimen of the humble confession and fervent prayer here alluded to, is to be found in the ninth chapters respectively of Daniel, of Ezra, and in the first of Nehemiah. We there see which kind of humiliation is acceptable before God, and what gracious expressions of kindness it meets with. And so we learn from the sure word of prophecy, that there will yet come again a great and universal repentance of that ancient, honored, and afflicted people; that they shall look upon him whom they have pierced and mourn; that they will return and seek the Lord their God, and the spiritual David their king; and that then the Lord will set his hand a second time, and gather them out of all nations among whom they are scattered, and plant them again in their own land, where they shall for a long tract of ages be partakers in the richest blessings of the Gospel.——¶ *And the iniquity of their fathers.* The principle of the *unity* of the different generations of the Jewish race is recognized all along the line of their history. The children were to repent of the sins of their fathers, and if they could not be absolved from their own sins, except on condition of confessing their fathers', their fathers' iniquities, unrepented of, became their own, and also the punishment due to them.

41. *If then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled.* Chal. 'Gross, or foolish, hearts.' Targ. Jon. 'Proud hearts.' The phrase implies a perverse heart; one which prompted them to resist the spirit of God. Accordingly we find the Jews in the apostles' times thus characterized: Acts 7. 51, 'Ye stiff-necked and *uncircumcised in heart* and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.' This is said because, as we learn elsewhere, Rom. 2. 29, the true circumcision is 'in the heart,' and 'in the spirit.' Conformably to this the prophet complains, Jer. 9. 26, that 'all the house of Israel are *uncircumcised in heart.*'——¶ *Accept of the punishment of their iniquity.* Heb. רִרְצוּ אֶת עֲוֹנָם *yirtzu eth avonâm, accept of their iniquity.* As the words 'iniquity' and 'sin' are often used by an idiom of the Hebrew for the 'punishment' due to transgression, so to accept the same is meekly and willingly to bear it, and even to be well pleased with it (the term in the original being the same with that employed, v. 34, and rendered 'enjoy'), as the most suitable

42 Then will I [u]remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will [x]remember the land.

43 [y]The land also shall be left of them, and shall enjoy her sabbaths, while she lieth desolate

[u] Exod. 2. 24, and 6. 5. Ps. 106. 45. Ezek. 16. 60.

[x] Ps. 136. 23. [y] ver. 34, 35.

means to bring them to repentance. An illustration of this sentiment occurs, Mic. 7. 9, 'I will *bear the indignation* of the Lord, for I have sinned against him.'

42. *Then will I remember my covenant.* This remembrance on the part of God signifies his *actual performance* of the mercies promised; as appears from Ex. 6. 5, 6, 'I have *remembered my covenant*, &c. and will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.' So our *remembering* God's precepts is explained, Ps. 103. 18, as equivalent to *doing* them. See Note on Gen. 8. 1. So again when Christ, 'the horn of salvation,' was raised up in the house of David, God is said, Luke 1. 72, 'to *perform* the mercy promised to our fathers, and to *remember his holy covenant.*' It is somewhat singular that in the original, the preposition answering to 'with' is omitted before each of the patriarchs' names in this connexion, and the fact ought to have been indicated by the usual Italic sign, in our version. The reason of the omission, or the bearing it ought to have on the construction, we are incompetent to state. The Gr. has μνησθησομαι της διαθηκης Ιακωβ, *I will remember the covenant of Jacob*, &c., omitting the suffix 'my' which occurs in the Hebrew.——¶ *Will remember the land.* That is, to cause it to be repeopled by its former inhabitants or their seed.

43. *The land shall also be left of them.* Heb. מהם *mêhem*, which may be rendered either *by them*, or *on their account*, *for their sakes.* This verse, in the connexion in which it stands, is somewhat obscure. As the tone of the context is bland and encouraging, we naturally inquire how it is that a transition is suddenly made to the language of threatening. It seems, on the whole, on comparing it with what follows, that the design of its introduction here is to heighten the expression of mercy in the ensuing verse. God had said in the preceding verse that he would 'remember the land;' but the favor involved in such a promise, could only be appreciated by a just view of the condition to which the land would have been reduced by reason of the sins of its inhabitants. Notwithstanding it should have been left destitute of its occupants, who were driven away into penal exile, and should thus remain desolate and uncultivated, enjoying the septennial sabbaths which had been denied it in their season, yet for all that, he would not forget or forego his mercies; he would remember the land by remembering its possessors, and bringing them back from their dispersion and planting them again within its borders.——¶ *And shall enjoy her sabbaths.* Heb. תרץ את שבתתיה *tiretz eth shabbethothëhâ.* Gr. προσδεξεται τα σαββατα αυτης, *shall receive her sabbaths.* The true force of the language in this verse can be understood only by a correct explication of the original word for 'enjoy,' which is employed here and also in the subsequent clause, 'shall *accept* (ירצו *yirtzu*) of the punishment of their iniquity.' Its primary meaning is *to have pleasure, delight, complacency in any thing;* and the drift of the passage is undoubtedly to convey the idea, by an ironical intimation, that while the land in its desolation was having pleasure in its sabbaths, the people of Israel were also, if the expression could be allowed, having pleasure in the punishment of their iniquity. There would at least

without them: and they shall accept of the punishment of their iniquity; because, even because they [z] despised my judgments, and because their soul abhorred my statutes.

44 And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, [a] I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant

[z] ver. 14. [a] Deut. 4. 31. 2 Kings 13. 23. Rom. 11. 2.

with them: for I *am* the LORD their God.

45 But I will [b] for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, [c] whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt [d] in the sight of the heathen, that I might be their God: I *am* the LORD.

46 [e] These *are* the statutes, and

[b] Rom. 11. 28. [c] ch. 22. 33, and 25. 38 [d] Ps. 98. 2. Ezek. 20. 9, 14, 22. [e] ch. 27. 34. Deut. 6. 1, and 12. 1, and 33. 4. John 1. 17.

be so much of a parallel in the two cases, that the same form of speech should be employed in reference to both. It is indeed a bold figure of speech to represent the inhabitants as taking pleasure in the calamities which they had procured to themselves; but as they had *voluntarily* incurred them 'despising the judgments of God and abhorring his statutes,' when perfectly aware of the consequences, was he not authorized to charge them with having *complacency* in the course of transgression which they had adopted? He is but stating the legitimate conclusion to be drawn from the premises. On this view of the language it is not only strictly proper, but highly significant and emphatic, and pointed with the sting of a well merited rebuke.——

¶ *Because, even because they despised my judgments*, &c. The particle is here doubled, to give intensity to the alleged reason of their calamities, and to intimate that it was *nothing else* than their deliberate rejection of the divine laws which had procured them. If so, had they any grounds to be surprised that it was charged upon them that they *preferred, were pleased with, enjoyed*, the natural results of their conduct? This interpretation, it will be seen, perfectly harmonizes with that given above.

44. *Yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies*, &c. The history of the Jewish people to the present day, is a standing proof of the truth of this merciful declaration. Though scattered and peeled, and pressed down by an unprecedented weight of misfortunes from age to age, yet they still subsist as a distinct people, and the covenant of future restoration remains to them unbroken. It may be remarked, moreover, as their plagues and afflictions, as a people, are at this day vastly mitigated, and every year growing less and less, by reason of the increasing humanity of civil codes and a softened tone of public sentiment throughout the civilized world, we are doubtless warranted to believe that the period of their deliverance has well-nigh arrived, and that nothing is needed to this result but the spirit on their part of profound repentance and the humble confession here prescribed.

45. *I will for their sakes remember the covenant*, &c. That is, for their good and advantage. He does not indeed, in this connexion *expressly* assure them of their being brought back to their own land, but the whole scope of the context requires us to understand it. How could he *effectually remember* them for good when in the land of their enemies, otherwise than by restoring their captivity? And why should he refer to the deliverance from Egypt, except to intimate that in like manner he would bring them to their own borders?

46. *These are the statutes, and judg-*

judgments, and laws, which the LORD made between him and the children of Israel [f] in mount Sinai by the hand of Moses.

[f] ch. 25. 1. [a] Numb. 6. 2. See Judges 11. 30, 31, 39. 1 Sam. 1. 11, 28.

ments, and laws, &c. This verse appears so peculiarly proper, as the conclusion of the whole book, that it is extremely difficult to account for the addition of the chapter which follows, containing matter of a ceremonial kind, such as would come in far more appropriately in a preceding part of the book. Adam Clarke proposes to solve the difficulty by supposing that there has been an accidental transposition of chap. 27, from where it belongs, at the close of the 25th. Others think that the 27th was added after the book was finished; but nothing is certain, and we have to receive the sacred canon as we find it.

CHAPTER XXVII.

It is and always has been customary in different countries and under various systems of religion, for persons in peculiar circumstances of prosperity or adversity, to *vow* that they will make certain offerings, or devote certain properties to the service of God. To such vows, usually called נדר *neder*, most of the present chapter refers. Under the influence of extraordinary zeal individuals, for instance, might sometimes be induced to consecrate themselves, their children, or estate, to God by what is here termed a 'singular vow.' But it was possible that upon reflection, in a cooler moment, the person might regret the step he had taken, or particular circumstances might render the *literal* performance of this vow inconvenient or unsuitable, in which case provision is made in the present chapter for the *redemption* of the persons or things thus consecrated, and a *table of rates* is here given by which the priests were to be governed in their *estimation* of the value

CHAPTER XXVII.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, [a] When a man shall make a singular vow,

of the thing vowed. It does not appear that it was the purpose of the law to enforce the practice, but merely to place a natural impulse of devotion under wise regulations. If an Israelite under such an impulse should bind himself or his child by a vow, to be a servant of the sanctuary, he might commute that service by paying a specified pecuniary equivalent, varying with sex and age, into the sacred treasury; and if he were too poor to pay the prescribed sum, it was in the discretion of the priest to fix upon some other, proportioned to his means. If the vow related to the gift of an animal, it must, by all means, be offered in sacrifice, if suitable to be so offered; and whoever was detected in attempting to substitute for it one of inferior worth, was punished by the forfeiture of both. If it were an unclean animal that had been consecrated, the owner might still retain it, if, on reflection, such was his wish, on the payment of one-fifth more than the priest declared to be its value. On the same condition a house or a farm, consecrated as a religious offering, might be redeemed. The estimation of the value of an estate so consecrated was to have reference to the length of the interval between the time of the consecration and a jubilee year, at which time it reverted to its owner; and this provision held equally good, if the estate consecrated was one of which the devotee was only a tenant. But the details of the various provisions of the present law will come before us as we proceed.

The Law of a Singular Vow when it had respect to Persons.

2. *When a man shall make a singular vow.* Heb. אִישׁ כִּי יִפְלֶא נֶדֶר *ish ki*

the persons *shall be* for the LORD, by thy estimation.

3 And thy estimation shall be, of the male from twenty years old even unto sixty years old; even thy estimation shall be fifty shekels of silver, [b] after the shekel of the sanctuary.

[b] Exod. 30. 13.

yaphli nëder, a man when he shall have singled out, separated, signalized a vow. The word 'singular' in our version is doubtless tantamount to *extraordinary*, and yet as there is no corresponding epithet in the original, the idea is involved in the force of the verb פלא *yaphli*=פלה *yaphleh*, which latter, as we have seen (Note on Ex. 8. 22,) has the import of *separating or setting apart in a wonderful and glorious manner.* The usage is still farther illustrated by reference to the case of the Nazarite, Num. 6. 2, 'When a man or woman *shall separate* (פלא *yaphli*) to vow a vow,' &c., i. e. shall signally separate. It is rendered by the Gr. ὃς αν μεγαλως ευξεται ευχην, *whoever shall greatly vow a vow.* So here the idea is of vowing something in a *signal* way, in a mode striking and extraordinary. By Philo this kind of vow is termed ευχη μεγαλη, *the great vow*, as being an act of special and distinguished devotion. The epithet 'singular,' therefore, in this connexion is equivalent to 'singling out.'——¶ *The persons shall be for the Lord, by thy estimation.* Heb. בערכך נפשת ליהוה *beerkekâ nephâshoth laihovah, by thy estimation the souls, or persons (shall be) for the Lord.* A man might dedicate himself to the service of the sanctuary, and become, as it were, a servant attached thereto. In the same way he might vow his child. Samuel was thus devoted by his mother, and remained in the service of the sanctuary; for that appropriation being apparently satisfactory to all parties, he was not redeemed according to the valuation here fixed for different ages and sexes. But the actual personal dedication was seldom practised, and hence the meaning undoubtedly is, that the service of the persons thus devoted was not usually to be employed in the sanctuary, but a value set upon it by the priest, and *that* employed for the Lord, i. e. for holy uses in general. The reason for this substitution probably was, that there was a sufficient number of persons officially designated for all the various work of the tabernacle; and this a more numerous attendance would merely encumber and retard. On the expression 'thy estimation,' commentators have disputed whose estimation as intended; whether that of the priest, the ruler, or the worshipper, to be made from time to time. The obvious sense would seem to be, that it is addressed to the people at large. It is the language of law addressed to the community for which it is designed. Rosenmuller however, suggests that the original word ערכך *erkeku* is here to be taken not in an active but passive sense—the estimation at which thou shalt be rated. It was not, he remarks, the province of any individual to fix the rate of redemption, not even of the priest, except in the cases mentioned v. 8, 12, but of God himself, who in the present chapter proceeds to specify the terms on his own sovereign authority. This construction differs little from that we have given.

3. *Thy estimation shall be of the male*, &c. He begins with the male, and that too in the prime of life, when his services would be most valuable; and it will be observed that the rate is the same for persons of all conditions, to show that God regarded the vow, and not the rank of those who made it. The estimation in this case was to be 50 shekels of silver, which reckoned in our currency would be not far from $36. For a woman of the same age about $22; for a boy from

4 And if it *be* a female, then thy estimation shall be thirty shekels.

5 And if *it be* from five years old even unto twenty years old, then thy estimation shall be of the male twenty shekels, and for the female ten shekels.

6 And if *it be* from a month old even unto five years old, then thy estimation shall be of the male five shekels of silver, and for the female thy estimation *shall be* three shekels of silver.

7 And if *it be* from sixty years old and above; if *it be* a male, then thy estimation shall be fifteen shekels, and for the female ten shekels.

8 But if he be poorer than thy estimation, then he shall present himself before the priest, and the priest shall value him: according to his ability that vowed shall the priest value him.

9 And if *it be* a beast whereof men bring an offering unto the LORD, all that *any man* giveth of such unto the LORD shall be holy.

10 He shall not alter it, nor change it, a good for a bad, or a bad for a good: and if he shall at

---

five to twenty, $15; for a girl of the same age, $12; a male child, $4; a female, $3; a man above sixty, $11; a woman, $6. The *rules of mortality* are the principle on which these rates are graduated. The value was regulated according to the probability of life and service. None were vowed under a month old; and the first-born, being considered by a prior law, Ex. 12., the Lord's property, could not be vowed at at all.

4. *If it be a female.* The estimation of a female is here fixed at little more than one half that of a man, for the obvious reason that a woman if employed would not be of so much service in the sanctuary as the man. It is supposed, with great probability, that under the provision contained in this case Jephthah might have redeemed his daughter. See the point discussed at full length in the Note on Judg. 11. 30.

5. *If it be from five years old,* &c. It is supposed in this case that the vow was made by the parents, or one of them, and not by the child himself, who at that age was wholly incompetent to such a thing. Samuel, who was thus vowed to God, was not redeemed, because he was a Levite and a particular favorite, and therefore was employed in his childhood in the service of the sanctuary.

8. *If he be poorer than thy estimation.* That is, if he who made the vow be not able to pay the estimated value, then the priest shall rate the value according to his ability to pay.——¶ *Then he shall present himself.* Heb. והעמידו *heemido, he shall make him to stand;* i. e. the man who vowed shall present either himself or the subject of his vow. The term in the original is so framed as to include both.

Respecting Beasts that are vowed and their Valuation.

9. *A beast whereof men bring an offering.* That is, of the prescribed kinds of which they are accustomed to bring an offering; by which is meant clean beasts, unblemished, viz. bullocks, sheep, or goats. These could not be redeemed; and the firstlings, being already consecrated to God, could not be thus devoted.——¶ *Shall be holy.* Set apart for God's service according to the nature of the vow; that is to say, it shall be offered at the altar if given or vowed for sacrifice; or shall be given to the Priests or Levites if vowed for that end; or shall be sold and the value of it employed in the service of the sanctuary, if given with that intention; or left at large to be disposed of as should be deemed most meet for the service of God.

10. *He shall not alter or change it.* By 'alter' here is probably meant the

all change beast for beast, then it and the exchange thereof shall be holy.

11 And if *it be* any unclean beast, of which they do not offer a sacrifice unto the LORD, then he shall present the beast before the priest:

12 And the priest shall value it, whether it be good or bad: as thou valuest it *who art* the priest, so shall it be.

13 [c] But if he will at all redeem it, then he shall add a fifth *part* thereof unto thy estimation.

[c] ver. 15. 19.

14 ¶ And when a man shall sanctify his house *to be* holy unto the LORD, then the priest shall estimate it, whether it be good or bad: as the priest shall estimate it, so shall it stand.

15 [d] And if he that sanctified it will redeem his house, then he shall add the fifth *part* of the money of thy estimation unto it, and it shall be his.

16 And if a man shall sanctify unto the LORD *some part* of a field

[d] ver. 13.

substituting any other kind of beast or any other thing in its stead; whereas to 'change' it is to give any other beast of the same species in its place. Whatever was consecrated to God by a vow or purpose of heart was considered from that moment as the Lord's property; to *change* which was *impiety;* to *withhold* it *sacrilege.*——¶ *Then it and the exchange shall be holy.* That is, both of them shall be considered as consecrated to the Lord, and henceforth his property. The man was thus to be mulcted for his rashness, and the Jewish canonists say that he was to be beaten with stripes in addition.

11. *And if it be any unclean beast.* This may be understood generally of all unclean beasts, such as asses, camels, or other beasts of burden, which men might be prompted to vow, with the exception of the *dog*, of which it is said, Deut. 23. 18, 'Thou shalt not bring the price of a dog into the house of the Lord thy God for any vow.' The Hebrews, however, understood it of oxen, sheep, or goats, upon which any blemishes were found, whereby they became unclean, and were rendered unlawful to be offered upon the altar.

12. *Whether it be good or bad.* That is, whether it be of great or small value.

13. *But if he will at all redeem it,* &c. It was at the man's option either to leave the beast with the priest, or to pay him the price at which he had rated it. If he chose the latter, it was a sign that he deemed it worth more than the price which the priest had set upon it. The law was probably intended to prevent *rash* vows, by annexing somewhat of a penalty to them in the form of a pecuniary fine.

The Estimation of a devoted House.

14. *When a man shall sanctify his house to be holy unto the Lord.* That is, sanctify or set it apart by a dedicating vow.——¶ *As the priest shall estimate it, so shall it stand.* That is, such shall the value be, neither less nor more; no man shall attempt to alter it; only the owner if he would redeem it was to give the additional fifth part of the value; inasmuch as he should have considered well before he vowed it.

The Estimation of a devoted Field.

16. *Part of a field of his possession.* The phrase 'field of one's possession' signifies a field inherited from one's forefathers, and is used in contradistinction from a 'field which one hath bought,' spoken of v. 22. Though the words 'some part' are not expressed in the original, yet it is generally allowed that they should here be supplied; as it was not lawful for a man in this manner to alienate his whole patrimony. He might express his good will

of his possession, then thy estimation shall be according to the seed thereof: an homer of barley seed *shall be valued* at fifty shekels of silver.

17 If he sanctify his field from the year of jubilee, according to thy estimation it shall stand.

18 But if he sanctify his field after the jubilee, then the priest shall [e] reckon unto him the money according to the years that remain, even unto the year of the jubilee, and it shall be abated from thy estimation.

19 [f] And if he that sanctified the field will in any wise redeem it, then he shall add the fifth *part* of the money of thy estimation unto it, and it shall be assured to him.

20 And if he will not redeem the field, or if he have sold the field to another man, it shall not be redeemed any more.

[e] ch. 25. 15, 16. [f] ver. 13.

21 But the field, [g] when it goeth out in the jubilee, shall be holy unto the LORD, as a field [h] devoted: [i] the possession thereof shall be the priest's.

22 And if *a man* sanctify unto the LORD a field which he hath bought, which *is* not of the fields of [k] his possession;

23 [l] Then the priest shall reckon unto him the worth of thy estimation, *even* unto the year of the jubilee: and he shall give thine estimation in that day, *as* an holy thing unto the LORD.

24 [m] In the year of the jubilee the field shall return unto him of whom it was bought, *even* to him to whom the possession of the land *did belong.*

25 And all thy estimations shall be according to the shekel of the

[g] ch. 25. 10, 28, 31. [h] ver. 28. [i] Numb. 18. 14. Ezek. 44. 29. [k] ch. 25. 10, 25. [l] ver. 18. [m] ch. 25. 28.

for the house of God, but he must not for this purpose impoverish his own family.——¶ *Thy estimation shall be according to the seed thereof.* That is, according to the quantity of the seed required for sowing it; or perhaps according to the quantity of the produce. ——¶ *An homer of barley seed* shall be valued *at fifty shekels of silver.* The meaning is, that as much land as required a homer of barley to sow it should be valued at fifty shekels of silver. The *homer* was very different from the *omer;* the latter held about three quarts, the former seventy-five gallons and three pints.

18. *If he sanctify his field after the jubilee,* &c. That is, the field shall be reckoned more or less in value according to the number of years remaining to the year of jubilee.

20. *If he have sold the field.* That is, if the priest have sold it to another man, he who vowed it, could not then redeem it, though he had the option of doing so before; and if he who vowed it did not redeem it 'when it goeth out (of the possession of the purchaser), in the jubilee, it shall be holy (set apart) unto the Lord, as a field devoted (to his service); the possession thereof shall be the priest's,' v. 21, and the person who vowed it could never redeem it.

22–24. *If a man sanctify unto the Lord a field which he hath bought.* Consequently a field which was no part of his patrimonial inheritance, but which he had obtained by purchase from another source. When landed property of this kind was vowed, and of which the purchase or lease was to expire at the next jubilee, the priest was to fix a value upon it according to the number of years that should intervene till the next jubilee, and the vower might either redeem it or leave it to the priests; but whichever he did, it was to return of course at the jubilee to the original owner or his heirs.

25. *All thy estimation shall be accord*

sanctuary: [n] twenty gerahs shall be the shekel.

26 ¶ Only the [o] firstling of the beasts, which should be the LORD's firstling, no man shall sanctify it; whether *it be* ox, or sheep: it *is* the LORD's.

27 And if *it be* of an unclean beast, then he shall redeem *it* according to thine estimation, [p] and shall add a fifth *part* of it thereto: or if it be not redeemed, then it shall be sold according to thy estimation.

28 [q] Notwithstanding, no devoted thing that a man shall devote unto the LORD of all that he hath, *both* of man and beast, and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed: every devoted thing *is* most holy unto the LORD.

[n] Exod. 30. 13. Numb. 3. 47, and 18. 16. Ezek. 45. 12. [o] Exod. 13. 2, 12, and 22. 30. Numb. 18. 17. Deut. 15. 19. [p] ver. 11, 12, 13.

[q] ver. 21. Josh. 6. 17, 18, 19.

---

ing to the shekel of the sanctuary. So called, it is supposed, from the fact that the standard of this as the foundation of all the other weights and measures was kept in the sanctuary. A literal rendering however of the original may be 'shekel of sanctity, or holiness;' i. e. a true, just, honest shekel.

Firstlings not to be Vowed.

26. *Only the firstling of the beasts,* &c. These all belonged to God, by virtue of a previous express law, Ex. 13. 2, 12, 13,—22. 30, and it would be a kind of mockery to make an offering to another of that which was his own before.

The Redemption of unclean Beasts.

27. *And if it be of an unclean beast.* This is understood by Jarchi, of such unclean beasts as are spoken of v. 11, which a man set apart by vow 'to the repairs of the sanctuary.' Others, however, understand it of the *firstling males of unclean beasts,* which, as they were not consecrated to God by law, might be dedicated, or rather the proceeds of them, as votive offerings. Because an unclean beast might not be offered in sacrifice, it does not follow that the price of it might not be used in the repairs of the sanctuary and the maintenance of the priests, and therefore be the subject of a vow.

Of Things irredeemably devoted.

28. *Notwithstanding, no devoted thing.* Heb. חרם *'herem.* Gr. *ἀνάθεμα,* or *curse.* This is not the נדר *nëder* or common vow, such as we have previously considered, but one of a far more solemn kind, and which is but inadequately represented by the term 'devoted thing' in our version. It signifies properly a vow made with imprecations or execrations by the vower on himself or others if that should not be done in which he engaged. Of the precise difference between the form of the נדר *nëder* and the חרם *'herem,* we are not particularly informed by Moses, but it is clear from this passage that a thing devoted to God by *'herem,* was *irrevocably* devoted beyond the power of redemption. A man, for instance, devoted in this solemn way an ox, a cow, a field, to the Lord, imprecating a curse to himself if he withheld it, or ever reclaimed it, and a curse upon any one who should take it away or alienate it. Such things by this law could never be redeemed or appropriated to any other use; and it is evident from the use of the word 'notwithstanding' (אך *ak, nevertheless*), that this rule is introduced as an exception to the general regulations concerning vows contained in the previous part of the chapter, by which redemptions were amply provided for. ——¶ *Is most holy unto the Lord.* Heb. קדש קדשים *kodesh kodoshim, holiness of holinesses.* Other things devoted by a simple vow were merely *holy,* but these, from the greater sanctity attached

29 [r]None devoted, which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed: *but* shall surely be put to death.

30 And [s]all the tithe of the land, *whether* of the seed of the land, *or* of the fruit of the tree, *is* the LORD'S: *it is* holy unto the LORD.

31 [t]And if a man will at all redeem *aught* of his tithes, he shall add thereto the fifth *part* thereof.

[r] Numb. 21. 2, 3. [s] Gen. 28. 22. Numb. 18. 21, 24. 2 Chron. 31. 5, 6, 12. Neh. 13. 12. Mal. 3. 8, 10.

[t] ver. 13.

to the transaction, were denominated *most holy*, and were not to be touched except by the priests. It may here be remarked that the peculiar word *harem*, applied to the female part of an oriental household establishment, is in all probability derived from the same root with *'herem*, and carries with it the implication of something *set apart by the most sacred consecration*, and which no one could invade without the danger of anathema and destruction.

29. *None devoted, which shall be devoted of man, shall be redeemed*, &c. Heb. מן האדם *min hââdâm, of man.* It appears plain, beyond question, from v. 28, that human beings as well as brute beasts were among the subjects of the *'herem*. The present phrase is undoubtedly correctly rendered 'of men,' i. e. as the subjects of the vow, instead of 'by men,' as the agents of it. Yet we can hardly suppose that the drift of the passage is to intimate that a parent or master should or could, merely from a sudden religious impulse, devote a child or servant *to death*, although the case of Jephthah approximates very near to such a reckless and impious act. The legitimate import seems to be, to repeat in a more emphatic manner that part of the precept in the preceding verse, which had respect to man; or, in other words, simply to declare that when *a person*, whether child or slave, had been thus most solemnly and irrevocably given away to God, he was never on any consideration to be reclaimed or redeemed. But is it not said, however, that 'he shall surely be put to death,' and does not this imply that Israelitish parents and masters had the power of thus devoting their children or slaves to death? To this it may be answered that the original phrase מות ירומת *moth yumoth, dying shall die*, may without violence be interpreted in this connexion, not of any violent death in consequence of the vow, but simply that he should *remain in that devoted state until he died.* This is the interpretation proposed by several distinguished commentators, and, indeed, considering this law in relation to the duty of *private individuals*, there seems to be no other sense that does not outrage the spirit of the divine code, which breathes such a tender concern for human life. But the subject, it must be admitted, assumes another aspect, when viewed in relation to a national *'herem*, which might be made and executed against the public enemies of Israel, or those *devoted* nations who, by the special appointment of God, were doomed to remediless destruction. Such a vow on the part of the peculiar people was but an echo, as it were, of the *'herem* of the Almighty, and it was to be punctiliously executed. Thus the Canaanites were *vowed* to total excision, because God had thus decreed. Thus too, the city of Jericho in particular was devoted, Josh. 6. 17, and the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead were put to death for violating the curse pronounced upon those who came not up to Mizpeh, Judg. 29. 10. Thus, too, if an Israelitish city introduced the worship of strange gods, it was in like manner to be *devoted* or *confessed* to God, and to remain unbuilt for ever. Deut. 13. 16–18.

The Law of Tithes.

30. *All the tithe of the land.* The 'tithe' of any thing is its tenth part.

32 And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, *even* of whatsoever [u] passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the LORD.

33 He shall not search whether it be good or bad, [x] neither shall he change it: and if he change it at all, then both it and the change thereof shall be holy; it shall not be redeemed.

34 [y] These *are* the commandments which the LORD commanded Moses for the children of Israel in mount Sinai.

[u] See Jer. 33. 13. Ezek. 20. 37. Mic. 7. 14. [x] ver. 10.

[y] ch. 26. 46.

Of the yearly products of the land of the Israelites, the first-fruits were first deducted; out of the rest the tenth part was taken for the Levites, Num. 18. 21; of the nine remaining parts, another tenth part was to be taken and brought to Jerusalem, and there eaten by the owners, Deut. 12. 6; though this second tithe was every third year distributed to the poor, Deut. 28. 29.

32. *Of whatsoever passeth under the rod.* This is thus explained by the Rabbinical writers: 'When a man was to give the tithe of his sheep or calves to God, he was to shut up the whole flock in one fold, in which there was one narrow door capable of letting out one at a time. The owner about to give the tenth to the Lord stood by the door with a rod in his hand, the end of which was dipped in vermillion or red ochre. The mothers of these lambs or calves stood without; the door being opened, the young ones ran out to join themselves to their dams; and as they passed out, the owner stood with his rod over them, and counted 1, 2, 3, &c., and when the *tenth* came, he touched it with the colored rod, by which it was distinguished to be the tithe calf, sheep, &c., and whether poor or lean, perfect or blemished, that was received as the legitimate tithe.' It is probably in reference to this custom that the prophet speaking to Israel says, Ezek. 20. 37, 'I will cause you to pass under the rod, and will bring you into the word of the covenant;' i. e. you shall be once more claimed as the Lord's property and be in all things devoted to his service, being *marked* or *ascertained* by special providences and manifestations of his kindness to be his peculiar people

E.H. Gifford
Romans

W.H. Green
The Arguement of the Book of Job Unfolded

William Greenhill
Ezekiel

E.W. Hengstenburg
Ecclesiastes

Robert Johnstone
James

H.P. Liddon
Romans

Lillie
I, II Peter

T. M. Lindsay
The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries

Walter Maier
Nahum

J.B. Mayor
James

J A Seiss
Voices from Babylon

C. Von Orelli
Prophecies of Isaiah
Minor Prophets

C.H.H. Wright
Daniel

Zahn
Introduction to the New Testament (3 Volumes)

The Limited Classical Reprints are printed in small quantities which allows us to come out with more titles in one year. Some of our titles have been sold out in a matter of days after coming off the press. All our titles have been selling very quickly, therefore, it is essential that you give your retailer your order for future titles promptly.

William Carey Int'l University
3 1539 00059903

JAMES & KLOCK

Limited Classical Reprint Library

James & Klock Christian Publishing Company carries a burden from the Lord to enrich the evangelical field with almost impossible to obtain, conservative commentaries. Each volume to be published was carefully selected from the many thousands of older commentaries no longer available. Each commentary was chosen on the basis of their massive scholarship and suggestive thought so often missing in today's popular works. It does not take the student of the Scriptures long to discern that many of the most helpful commentaries ever written are out-of-print. The "Limited Classical Reprint Library" was estiblished to make available in attractive, quality bindings these timeless, priceless writings of evangelical scholars, teachers, and preachers.

The "Limited Classical Reprint Library" is printed in small quantities which allows us to come out with more titles in one year. Some of our titles have been sold out in a matter of days after they came off the press. All our titles have been selling very quickly, therefore, it is essential that you give your retailer your order for future titles promptly.